The Communist

20c. MAY 1940

THE BOLSHEVIZATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

GENE DENNIS

SOCIAL-DEMOCRATISM: THE MAIN OBSTACLE TO OVERCOME

(REVIEW OF THE MONTH)

THE HAYMARKET MARTYRS AND MAY DAY, 1940

OAKLEY JOHNSON

THE VATICAN AND ROOSEVELT

LOUIS F. BUDENZ

ZIONISM AND THE IMPERIALIST WAR

PAUL NOVICK

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR SPRING PUBLICATION

Dialectics of Nature, by Frederick Engels . . **$2.50**

Translated into English for the first time by Clemens Dutt, with an introduction by J. B. S. Haldane, this invaluable work on dialectical materialism and the natural sciences has been eagerly awaited by American readers. Its publication in May constitutes an important contribution to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism.

Why Farmers Are Poor: The Agricultural Crisis in the United States, by Anna Rochester . . . **$2.50**

The scope of this fundamental study of the farm problem in the United States is indicated by some of the chapter headings: Agriculture as Part of Capitalist Economy; How Capitalism Develops Within Agriculture; Rent and Land Tenure; Farm Wage Workers; The Crisis of Small Farmers; The Farmers' Price Problem, etc.

Salute to Spring, by Meridel Le Sueur . . **$1.50**

A volume of short stories which have been highly praised by many critics. Some of the selections in this book include: "No Wine in His Cart," "Fable of a Man and Pigeons," "A Hungry Intellectual," "Biography of My Daughter," "Tonight Is Part of the Struggle."

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XIX, No. 5 MAY, 1940

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	*A. B.*	387
The Bolshevization of the Communist Party of the United States in the Struggle Against the Imperialist War	*Gene Dennis*	403
The Haymarket Martyrs and May Day, 1940	*Oakley Johnson*	418
The Reactionary Political Role of the Vatican	*Louis F. Budenz*	431
The Impact of the War on the Structure of Capitalism	*George Brahns*	451
Zionism and the Imperialist War	*Paul Novick*	463
Greetings to "Clarity"		480

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A. 209

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON IMPERIALISM AND WAR

Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, by V. I. Lenin **$.30**

The War and the Second International, by V. I. Lenin . . **.20**

Is This a War for Freedom? by Ernst Fischer . . . . **.10**

The People Against the War-Makers, by Earl Browder . . **.05**

Social-Democracy and the War, by V. J. Jerome . . . **.05**

The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries by Georgi Dimitroff . . . . . **.02**

The War Crisis: Questions and Answers, by William Z. Foster **.05**

A Negro Looks at War, by John Henry Williams . . . **.03**

The War and the Workers, by V. I. Lenin (Ready in May) . **.10**

I Didn't Raise My Boy to Be a Soldier—For Wall Street, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn . . . . . **.01**

●

Imperialism and the Imperialist War (1914-1917) by V. I. Lenin **2.00**

Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, by Joseph Stalin **1.50**

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

The Forthcoming Communist Nominating Convention. Candidates and Platform. Promoting the Anti-Imperialist People's Front and Building the Communist Party. Social-Democratism Is the Main Obstacle to Combat. What Is the Role of Norman Thomas & Co.? Communist Policies in National Elections. The Growth of Anti-War Movements. External and Internal Factors in the Anti-War Struggle. Molotov's Report. Greater Vigilance and Renewed Confidence. For Resistance to All Manifestations of Capitalist Offensive. Dies and the Communists. On Certain Anti-Marxist Criticisms. Stalin's Contributions to Marxism. Scientific Spirit Versus Bourgeois Class Spirit. Theory and Experience. The Struggle for Bolshevization. On Stalin's Art to Foresee Events. The Power of Revolutionary Theory and Self-Critical Evaluations.

THE forthcoming National Convention of the Communist Party, to be held May 30-June 3 in New York City, will be a Presidential nominating convention for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President and for the adoption of an election platform. Thus the Communist Party will equip itself for entering the election struggle in order to promote the movements of the masses against the imperialist war, against capitalist reaction and intensified exploitation and for the further strengthening of the Party as the revolutionary vanguard of the American working class. We are on the eve of a significant stage in the fight for the anti-imperialist people's front and in the historic march to socialism.

In other words, we have immediate practical objectives to be attained in the election struggle. They are: to stimulate further the development and struggles of the anti-imperialist and anti-war mass movements, the struggle for the economic standards and civil rights of the masses, to promote the struggle for the class unity of the proletariat, bringing forth the working class ever more prominently as the initiator and leader of these struggles. They are—these practical objectives—to help secure the maximum possible independent political action of labor and its allies in the forthcoming elections, orientating these developments towards an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly party of peace. They are to build and strengthen the Communist Party itself, to widen and solidify its contacts with the masses, to protect and defend its legal existence, to raise to new heights the ideologi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal and political level of our entire work.

These practical objectives arise from the most intimate and burning needs of the masses of the people. They are the major immediate needs of the American working class and its allies—the toiling farmers, the youth, the Negro people, the women, and the aged. They are the needs of the great gathering coalition of labor with all common people, the coalition for which John L. Lewis again spoke so eloquently before the miners of northern West Virginia on April 1. More than that: the immediate practical objectives of the Communist Party in the elections are the very objectives for which progressive labor and its allies are already fighting. Therefore, in fighting for the realization of the practical objectives of the Communist Party in the elections, we shall be standing shoulder to shoulder with the progressive mass movements and in their front ranks.

But this is not all. The Communist Party aims to build itself into a leading vanguard party of the American working class. It strives to become a true Bolshevik Party. What does that mean? It means that every immediate and practical action that we engage in must be so planned and carried out as to lead *naturally* to the deepening of the political understanding of the working class, to the raising of its political position of initiative and leadership, to accelerating the historic movement of labor to becoming the leader of the nation. It should naturally train and educate the working class in the spirit of its historic mission of leading the toiling people to the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism.

And it is for these purposes, for the realization of these great aims, that the Communist Party enters the election struggle with its own candidates and platform. The Communist Party, says Comrade Stalin in his Bolshevization principles, must not regard itself "as an appendage of the parliamentary election machine," as the Socialist Party does, or as "a free supplement of the trade unions," as certain anarcho-syndicalists say, "but as the *highest* form of class combination of the proletariat." (Quoted by Georgi Dimitroff, "Stalin and the World Proletariat," *The Communist International,* No. 1, 1940, pp. 18-19.) And this means the carrying out in the election struggles of a rounded-out campaign to intensify the mass struggles on all fronts, to unify and concentrate their political expression in the maximum mass support for the platform and standard-bearers of the Communist Party, to build the anti-imperialist people's front under labor's leadership, to project the further perspectives of this struggle on the road to socialism, to train the working class in its historic liberating mission.

From this it follows that one of the chief political tasks of the election campaign is to expose the imperialist, war-making and capitalist reactionary character of the two bourgeois parties and thus to stimulate further the separation of the American working class and its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allies from these parties. Having this clearly in mind, it must also be realized that one of the main *obstacles* to the fulfilment of this task is *Social-Democratism* in its various forms: Norman Thomasism, Waldman-Dubinsky-Rose & Co., the Woll-Hutcheson clique, the Roosevelt-boosters in the labor movement (Hillman, etc.), and, of course, the professional wreckers—the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites.

These constitute one of the main obstacles, if not the main one, for a significant advance by labor and its allies in the coming elections. Therefore, to expose these agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the labor movement and to isolate them from the masses is a major task in the central struggle of progressive labor to build its own independent political power and to resist most effectively the reactionary and war-making offensive of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

We must not let the people become deceived by the fact that there seems to be little apparent "unity" in the camp of Social-Democratism, although there is a considerable degree of united action between them even on the surface of things and in public actions. For example: *the deep-rooted hostility of all these groups of Social-Democratism to the progressive labor movement,* concentrating naturally on the C.I.O., but embracing in their hatred also the creative forces in the A. F. of L. This is no accident, as we well know, because this progressive labor movement has proved the most dynamic force in American life for the further advancement of the working class and its allies. That is why the bourgeoisie fears and hates it. That is why its reformist agents, its agents in the labor movement, work unceasingly for the weakening and wrecking of this movement.

Is there any difference between the hostility of Norman Thomas to the progressive labor movement, symbolized by the C.I.O., and say that of Waldman-Dubinsky, or of Woll and Hutcheson? No difference at all in substance, though there is some in form. Norman Thomas pursues his line of hostility to the C.I.O. and to the progressives in the A. F. of L. in the name of "socialism." Woll and Hutcheson do not speak of socialism. But the reactionary wrecking and splitting work they are doing *is the same.* Note the practical "unity" of some of these wrecking forces to destroy the American Labor Party in New York. And this is only one of the more dramatic expressions of the work of all these varieties of Social-Democratism to obstruct the unity and progress of American labor, to attach it to the imperialist machine of the capitalist class.

Or take the question of imperialism and war. The spokesmen of the Social-Democratic camp say that they are in favor of keeping America out of war. So do Hoover, Dewey and Roosevelt. Who would dare speak openly to the contrary? But what is the truth? All these varieties of Social-Democratism are following the line of the American imperialist bourgeoisie, reflecting within their camp the same differences on secondary questions as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exist within the bourgeoisie itself.

Waldman-Dubinsky-Rose are in favor of Anglo-French imperialism and are working in the labor movement to drag America into the war on the side of the Allies. Norman Thomas & Co. are also taking sides between the imperialists, expressing "our preference for British and French imperialism with all its faults" (*Socialist Call*, March 30), and intimating weakly that America's joining the war wouldn't change much. But the expression of "preference" for Anglo-French imperialism as against German imperialism is already laying the "ideological" base for dragging America into the war. And this is the main thing that the American imperialist bourgeoisie desires among the working masses. Just let Norman Thomas go on and befuddle the American toilers, in the name of "socialism," with the idea that Anglo-French imperialism is to be preferred to German imperialism. The rest—the actual dragging of America into the war—will then be not so difficult. And as to the "traditional" supporters of the capitalist parties in the labor movement, they more or less openly peddle the imperialist policies of the bourgeoisie, differing among themselves when the bourgeoisie differs.

Above all, the American imperialist bourgeoisie needs Social-Democratism for incitement against the Soviet Union. And the Social-Democratic camp, always assisted by the wrecking crews of Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, are trying to "rise" to the occasion. They did their job for Mannerheim's White Guards in Finland and, if they failed, it wasn't because they lacked zeal or devotion to their imperialist masters. They are now preparing to do their job in the election campaign—to slander the Soviet Union and to incite against it. This is a major assignment for them by the imperialist bourgeoisie, since political reaction at home and intensified preparations for war abroad go today hand in hand with incitements against the Soviet Union.

In other words: incitement against the Soviet Union is today part and parcel of the offensive of the American imperialist bourgeoisie upon the working people at home and of the preparations for war abroad. Norman Thomas & Co., speaking in the name of "socialism" and having expressed a preference for Anglo-French imperialism, will be fulfilling in the election campaign the assignment of their capitalist masters, which is to promote among the masses their anti-Soviet orientation as well as their hatred and hostility to the progressive labor movement, and to the C.I.O., in the first place.

It is clear, therefore, that the Communist Party will be able to fight effectively in the coming elections for the class objectives of labor and its allies *only* by fighting to unmask and isolate the camp of Social-Democratism, the agents of imperialism among the working people. As this fight is being developed, so will the struggle be advancing for the separation of the working people from the capitalist parties, for the consolidation of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-imperialist and anti-war front of the people, for the rallying of wide masses around the platform and standard bearers of the Communist Party.

And, lastly, the "socialist" demagogy of Norman Thomas & Co. This is no minor part of their treacherous equipment. For without speaking to the workers in the name of "socialism," without deceiving them with promises of a cheap and easy way to plenty and happiness, without parading before them as "democratic Socialists," Norman Thomas & Co. could do very little among the working people for their imperialist and war-making masters. This is how the unspeakable Blum has been operating in France, Attlee and Citrine in England. In short, this is how Norman Thomas' Social-Democratic brethren are betraying the working class in all capitalist countries, leading the attack against the Communist Parties.

Therefore, the exposure of the fake of "democratic socialism" is a major part in the election struggle. It is necessary to prove that this gentry is fighting neither for democracy nor for socialism but for capitalism, imperialism and reaction. These people are helping the bourgeoisie to attack and undermine the civil liberties of the masses. They are helping the bourgeoisie to drag this country into the imperialist war. Given their way, the Norman Thomases will bring the American working class to the same condition as Blum (another "democratic Socialist") has helped to create for the French working class, as the reactionary leaders of German Social-Democracy have helped to create for the German working class, as Attlee and Citrine are helping to create for the British working class: *war and reaction.*

It is necessary to show that the "democratic socialism" of the Norman Thomases is a fake and a delusion, designed to prevent the progress of the working class against the imperialist bourgeoisie. This is the role of Social-Democratism. And that's why it has to be isolated and defeated in order that American labor should advance, become stronger and more politically mature and independent. This is necessary in order that the American working class, in coalition with all common people, may realize its immediate and *partial* objectives, opening up the *perspective* for the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly people's peace front under working class leadership, thus creating the *transition* to the struggle for working class rule, resting on the *alliance* with all common people, to the socialist reorganization of society, to socialist and true democracy.

* * *

IT IS quite evident that the anti-war movements among the masses of the American people, in which labor displays growing initiative and leadership, are widening and gaining in strength. The broad nationwide anti-war demonstrations on April 6, which the imperialist press simply hated to report adequately, and the celebration on May Day are eloquent testimony to the fact that the mass anti-war and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-imperialist movements are becoming a serious obstacle to the war-spreading policies of American imperialism and of the Roosevelt Administration.

Ever larger masses are saying loudly and determinedly that the "Yanks Are Not Coming," that they demand "Work Not War," that they want friendly relations with the Soviet Union, that they are intent upon defending their civil rights and economic standards. They are expressing, in ever larger numbers, their active sympathy and support to the growing anti-war movements of the working masses in the belligerent countries, seeking to help bring the predatory imperialist war to an end.

The struggle for the anti-imperialist peace front of the people is making headway despite the desperate efforts of the imperialists and their agents in the labor movement to obstruct this process. Try as they may, the reformist, Social-Democratic and "Socialist" flunkeys of imperialism have not been able thus far to hamper seriously the development of the people's anti-war front. They will not stop trying, of course. They will become more desperate. Hence, the struggle against them must become more widespread, more persistent, more energetic.

At the same time, capitalist reaction is seeking for new and more effective avenues of attack upon the progressive labor movement and upon the Communist Party. And the Dies Committee is trying to do its part. Its attempt to build up a blacklist against Communists is clearly an act of reactionary revenge for the consistent and energetic anti-war work of the Communists, as well as a brutal violation of their civil rights. It is also an opening move to get at the membership lists of any organization which incurs the displeasure of the reactionaries and warmongers. It is the direct result of the imperialist policies of the Roosevelt Administration, of imperialist "activization" and war preparations, of growing capitalist reaction. It is the movement towards "M-Day."

The historic triumph of the Soviet Union's peace policy in Finland is having wide and most significant repercussions. And one of them is the infusion of greater *confidence* among the masses of the people everywhere in their struggles against the war-makers, in their efforts to bring the war to an end. The Soviet Union's triumph in Finland and the energetic prosecution of its independent socialist peace policy has immeasurably strengthened the anti-imperialist and anti-war camp in all capitalist countries. Comrade Molotov's disclosure of the fact "that the plans of British and French ruling circles to utilize our country [the Soviet Union] in the war against Germany have been frustrated and as a result they are pursuing a policy of revenge toward the Soviet Union," (V. M. Molotov, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, p. 6, Workers Library Publishers, New York) the disclosure and appreciation of this fact will not only endear the socialist state still more to the masses of our people but will greatly strengthen their determina-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion *to resist the increasing efforts of the Anglo-French bloc and their American supporters to spread the war and to drag this country into the war.* It will strengthen the determination of the American masses to do all in their power to prevent the imperialist bourgeoisie and the Roosevelt Administration from continuing to worsen relations with the Soviet Union. They will seek to compel an *improvement* in these relations.

Conscious of the growing dangers of the spreading of the war and of American involvement, the anti-imperialist peace forces of the country will be encouraged in their further struggles by the understanding that the chances for winning the fight against the warmongers are daily increasing. Looking abroad we find that the anti-war sentiments among the masses of the people are growing. We see it in England and in France. In the former, even in the ranks of the bourgeoisie, the group favoring the quickest ending of the war is gathering strength. And in the latter—in France—the brave conduct of the Communist Deputies on trial is symbolic and expressive of the growing anti-war sentiments of the French people.

These growing anti-war sentiments among the masses in the belligerent countries are a great source of strength to the anti-war movements in the United States, and vice versa. Consider this fact in connection with the growing prestige and influence of the Soviet Union and the power of its peace policies. Add to this the further unfolding of the anti-war mass movements in the United States and the increasing leadership of labor, the sharpening of the imperialist contradictions generally and specifically the contradictions between Anglo-American and American-Japanese imperialism, the strengthening of the anti-imperialist movements in Latin America and the struggle of the Chinese people for their independence, and, last, the developing contradictions within American imperialism itself. Consider the import of all these factors and the conclusion is inescapable that, while the dangers of America being dragged into the war are increasing, the opportunities for successfully combating these dangers have also increased.

With greater vigilance and renewed confidence, the anti-war and anti-imperialist forces in the country have to increase immeasurably their efforts to broaden and consolidate their forces against the offensive of the imperialists, warmongers and reactionaries; against these and against their Social-Democratic, reformist and "Socialist" flunkeys. Remembering always that the fight against the imperialist policies of the bourgeoisie and of the Roosevelt Administration has to be carried on hand in hand with the daily fight for the economic and political demands of the masses. It has to be broadened and promoted as a fight *against all manifestations of the capitalist offensive,* its imperialist, warmongering, political reaction and increased exploitation of the masses. It is the fight for these demands of the working class and its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allies which are embodied in the Legislative Program of the C.I.O. and which have been endorsed and are actively supported by the progressives in the A. F. of L., by the progressive youth, farmers and Negro people.

* * *

MANY and varied are the "criticisms" against Marxism circulating now among certain literary intellectual circles. And none makes less sense than the charge "that orthodox Marxism, as preached today by the Comintern, has lost the experimental spirit and the hospitality to new ideas that were shown by Marx and Engels." (*New Republic,* Feb. 26, 1940.)

Well, it all depends on what is meant by "experimental" and on what these "new" ideas are. The Marxism of Lenin and Stalin, the only Marxism today, has certainly proved beyond doubt that it is a living, creative and developing science. A science which is developing in closest and most intimate relationship with life, with experience, with every truly scientific discovery and, above all, with the revolutionary practice of the masses.

The socialist Soviet Union is a triumph of that science and so is the progress of the world revolutionary movement of the working class and its allies. Is it possible then that the *New Republic's* dislike of the orthodox Marxism "as preached today by the Comintern" originates not so much (if at all) from that journal's scientific and experimental spirit as *from certain class prejudices and oppositions?* Or, in plainer language, would it be too far-fetched to assume that the petty bourgeois and bourgeois spirit of the *New Republic* doesn't like Marxism-Leninism simply because it goes against its *class grain?* We are somewhat more confirmed in this belief by the additional criticism of the *New Republic,* which is that Comintern Marxism "excludes the discoveries in . . . comparative religion."

Marxism-Leninism, being the *science* of nature and society, certainly doesn't include "discoveries" in religion, whether comparative or otherwise, although it takes full notice also of such developments. But as to Marxism having lost the "experimental" spirit and "hospitality to new ideas," this deserves a little discussion.

In a recent article on Stalin's theoretical and practical contributions to Marxism, Comrade Manuilsky formulates a fundamental proposition. He says:

> "Thanks to Comrade Stalin's theoretical and practical constructive work, Marxism-Leninism today is the Marxism not only of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution *but also of the era of the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the globe.*" ("The Great Theoretician of Marxism," *The Communist International,* No. 1, 1940, p. 26.)

Take such a basic question of revolutionary theory and practice as the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. Marx and Engels, living in and studying *pre*-imperialist capitalism, "arrived at the conclusion that the socialist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution could not be victorious in one country, taken singly, that it could be victorious only by a simultaneous stroke in all, or the majority of the civilized countries." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* p. 357.) And from the middle to the end of the nineteenth century, this was a guiding principle for all Marxists.

But Marxist science did not stand still, just as capitalism did not stand still. By the beginning of the twentieth century, pre-imperialist capitalism had become *imperialist* capitalism, declining and decaying. Basing himself on Marxist theory, Lenin made a study of this new phase of capitalism and "arrived at the conclusion that the old formula of Engels and Marx no longer corresponded to the new historical conditions, and that the victory of the socialist revolution was quite possible in one country, taken singly." (*Ibid.*) And life has fully confirmed this theoretical conclusion.

What does that mean? Life is no automatic process, and socialist victories do not come of themselves, even though they are scientifically prognosticated. It means that a working class revolutionary party of a new type, the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin and Stalin, *guiding* itself by this theoretical conclusion and *defending* it against the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin gang, has organized the mass struggles, leading them to the victory of socialism. Thus the Bolsheviks have proved in practice the correctness of the Leninist conclusion "that the victory of the socialist revolution was quite possible in one country, taken singly." And this is the dialectical process of history.

From this it is evident that the Marxism of Lenin and Stalin, the Marxism of the Communist International, far from having lost the spirit of creative life and hospitality to new ideas, as might be concluded from the "criticisms" of the *New Republic,* has been continually developing and creating new ideas *in correspondence with the new historical conditions.*

One may not like these ideas. One may even hate the practical reality that results from the successful struggle for these new Marxist ideas. In fact, the world bourgeoisie and its hangers-on hate it very much: they fear and hate socialism, the socialist state, and the world revolutionary movement of the working class and its allies. But this only proves the correctness of the theory of the class struggle. It proves that the bourgeoisie is irreconcilably opposed to the working class and to its historic liberating mission. And it certainly does *not* prove that the Marxism of Lenin and Stalin has lost the spirit of creative life and experience or is inhospitable to new ideas. Quite the contrary. And the most conclusive living proof is Comrade Stalin's work and his leadership. Comrade Manuilsky formulates this fact as follows:

"Prior to the World War of 1914-18, Western European Social-Democracy professed its adherence to historical materialism in words; but it bowed its head fatalistically to capitalism, exaggerating its vitality,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its power and its opportunities for resistance. In the laws of historical materialism it saw merely an external elemental force which breaks down the human will; it ignored the active role of the working class." ("The Great Theoretician of Communism," *cited place*, p. 27.)

That was one conception of Marxist theory. It led to betrayal and defeat. But it was not Lenin's conception. Nor is it Stalin's.

"Comrade Stalin's conception of the laws of historical necessity, which runs through his entire revolutionary activity and his work as a statesman, represents a striking example of creative Marxism, which recognizes the tremendous role of the conscious influence exerted by people on the course of events, on the course of their history.

"In the present epoch it is Comrade Stalin who, more than anybody else, sagaciously takes into account objective obstacles that stand in the way of the revolutionary will of the working class, of the will of the socialist state; but at the same time it is Comrade Stalin who, more than anybody else, boldly sets revolutionary tasks designed to change the face of the world and of directing historical developments along the desired channels." (*Ibid.*)

Again we must say: one may not like these revolutionary tasks. One may object to and oppose the *direction* of historical development which results from the mass struggles led by Stalin. This is what the world bourgeoisie is doing, and those who follow the bourgeoisie are placing themselves in the camp of imperialism and reaction, dooming their efforts to eventual defeat. But that doesn't make them either alive or creative; nor does it make them hospitable to really new and progressive ideas. On the contrary, it makes them less so. *It cuts them off from progress altogether,* because the road of historical progress today is the one that leads to the Marxism of Lenin and Stalin.

Because that Marxism is not standing still, just as life is not standing still. Coming back to our discussion on the Lenin-Stalin theory of the victory of the socialist revolution in one country, we find this theory continually developing and reaching higher levels, in closest relationship with the practical victories of socialism and the progress of the world revolutionary movement. And in Stalin's theory and practice, in his further development of Marxism-Leninism, we find the concentrated expression of this process.

Says Manuilsky:

"Using the experience of the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R., Comrade Stalin has proved the truth of Lenin's thesis and, at the head of the Party and of the Soviet people, he has translated it into reality, has made it *the cornerstone of the strategy of the world proletariat,* of the strategy of the proletarian revolution. He has elevated this thesis of Lenin's to a lofty height and has made it the starting point of the entire policy of the socialist state, the basis for *the victory of socialism in the historic rivalry between the two worlds.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 29.)

And here is another basic and fundamental new idea. The historic rivalry between the world of capi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talism and the world of socialism is a *fact*. Those in the camp of capitalism want this historic rivalry to end in the victory of the capitalist world. On the other hand, those in the camp of the *victims* of capitalist exploitation, of its *opponents*, of the *fighters* against capitalist exploitation and capitalism, want and will want ever more strongly that this rivalry end in the victory of the socialist world. But the historic rivalry itself is a fact. It underlies all developments and struggles.

Now then, what does the Marxism of Lenin and Stalin do with this fact? It certainly doesn't overlook it. For one thing, because it helped to create this fact. But it does much more than merely take notice of it. It takes the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union and makes it the *basis* of the world strategy of the proletarian revolution. It makes it the *basis* for the victory of *socialism* in the historic rivalry between the world of growing socialism and the world of decaying capitalism. Thus, the Marxism of Lenin and Stalin proves itself once more a creative theory, growing in closest relationship with revolutionary practice and mass experience, alive to changing historical conditions and new tasks, and an indispensable weapon for directing events along desired channels. And we should add: channels desired by the needs and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the human race, channels dictated by the continued progress of the human race.

Speaking of Stalin's contributions to Marxism, Manuilsky continues:

"He has developed this thesis of Lenin's further and has arrived at the conclusion that *it is possible to build communism* in the U.S.S.R. while there exists a surrounding capitalist world. He has shown that this thesis of Lenin's is a motor driving forward the liberation movement of the working class in all countries, that it is a powerful means for strengthening *proletarian internationalism;* for the revolution in the victorious country is not a self-sufficient quantity, but a support that serves to accelerate the victory of the proletariat in other countries." (*Ibid.*)

Does this look like a theory that ignores experience, that is oblivious to changing conditions and inhospitable to new ideas? Quite the contrary. Provided these are *progressive* experiences, experiences derived from the struggle of the masses against capitalism, reaction and imperialism, experiences leading to further progress to socialism, to greater achievements for humankind. And provided: these new ideas are *progressive* ideas, ideas that widen and deepen human knowledge of nature and society, ideas that lighten the road to a happy life for the masses, that guide them and organize them to struggle for a superior and higher system of society.

It is true that Marxism-Leninism is very inhospitable to reactionary ideas, be they new or old. It is, in fact, militantly intolerant of them, and combative. But how else do progressive ideas and movements make their way and achieve victory if not in militant struggle against reactionary ideas and movements?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No one has more convincingly than Stalin proved the truth that the old and dying do not willingly make room for the new and growing; that, on the contrary, the closer the old system and its ideology approach their death, the more desperate and violent and unscrupulous becomes their resistance to the new system and the new ideology. And only revolutionary struggle decides the outcome. Revolutionary struggle of the masses, led by a revolutionary party of the most progressive class in society, and guided by a revolutionary theory.

And when we come to the more practical aspects of the work of such a party, what do we find *there* as regards new experiences, new tasks and new ideas? Do we find hostility and indifference to new things and developments? Not at all. Any such attitude is in total disagreement with the spirit and substance of the practical work of a Bolshevik Party, as it is with Marxist theory. See what Stalin stresses in his Bolshevization principles, in the principles which are helping the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries to become Bolshevik. We shall quote points three and four:

"3. The Party must base its slogans and directions not on formulas and historical parallels learned by rote, but on careful analysis of the concrete conditions of the revolutionary movement at home and abroad, in which the experience of revolution in all countries must absolutely be taken into account.

"4. The Party must test the slogans and directives in the fire of the revolutionary struggles of the masses." (Quoted by Georgi Dimitroff, "Stalin and the World Proletariat," *The Communist International*, No. 1, 1940, p. 18.)

Are these the guiding principles of a party that ignores the experiences of the progressive mass struggles, that refuse to listen to new progressive ideas? Quite the contrary. He who is moving forward, not backward; he who is helping the progresive movements of the working class and its allies, not hampering them; he who is genuinely looking for a way out of the hell of imperialism and capitalism, not merely creating a smokescreen to cover up his retreat from progress and surrender to imperialism; he finds no friendlier and more sincerely collaborative party than the Communist Party, the party that is guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

* * *

THE idea which is inspiring the pre-convention discussion of the Communist Party organizations, and which will underlie all the thoughts and actions of the National Convention itself, is the idea of Bolshevization. For never in the history of the American working class and its liberation movements was the need greater for a powerful and genuine revolutionary party, a party of a new type, a party of the model of the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union.

And what does this mean for the Communist Party of the United States? It means "an unceasing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle for the Bolshevization" of our Party. This is what it means—in the words of Comrade Dimitroff—for the Communist Parties of all capitalist countries. And how shall this be realized? To this Dimitroff replies:

"Proceeding from the historical experience of the Bolshevik Party, on the one hand, and mindful of the specific conditions in which the Communist movement is developing in the capitalist countries, on the other, Comrade Stalin tells us *what Bolshevization means and how it is to be attained.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 18.)

This Comrade Stalin tells us in the famous twelve propositions or principles of Bolshevization which he formulated in 1925. To realize these principles in the life and work of our Party, in the struggles of the American working class and its allies, to wage an unceasing fight for the realization of these principles, is a major task confronting our movement at the present time.

In the midst of the pre-convention discussion, it will be most appropriate to stress especially proposition number eight of the Stalin principles of Bolshevization. It says:

"8. The Party must not conceal its mistakes, it must not fear criticism, it must be able to improve and educate its forces using its own mistakes as an example." (*Ibid.*, p. 19.)

We will recall that this is one of the principles which made the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin great and glorious, which made it the model revolutionary working class party for all countries.

It was in the spirit of this principle that the February meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party—in the report of Comrade Browder, in the speech of Comrade Foster, in the general deliberations and in the resolutions—has laid the basis and given the lead for a self-critical examination of our work, for a more systematic struggle for the Bolshevization of our Party.

Analyzing the results and effects of our Party's National Committee meeting in Chicago last September, Comrade Browder said:

"We took note very sharply of the voices that were raised from the camp of reaction demanding national unity in terms of establishing a new council around the President which would determine the course of the country. We showed the falsity of that kind of national unity. . . . *We did not see far enough, however.* We saw clearly as far as we saw; but we did not see at that moment that Roosevelt would reject those reactionary proposals for something much worse, that is, that Roosevelt would himself assume leadership of the camp of reaction. Although we always knew that to be a possibility, *we did not forecast it,* and for weeks we were reluctant to accept the accumulating evidence that this was the course Roosevelt was taking." (Earl Browder, *The People Against the War-Makers,* p. 9, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

Everyone of us must seek to attain a deep and full understanding of this analysis. And what is the key? The key is that we did not see far enough and that we did not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forecast important developments. And this should remind us very forcefully of a helpful and penetrating criticism made by Comrade Manuilsky, in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, in March, 1939. Speaking of the progressive strengthening as well as existing weaknesses of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, he said:

"They have still a poor grasp of Stalin's great art of *foreseeing* events, of estimating the part played by the various states, classes and parties in these events, and of *anticipating* the maneuvers of the enemy, and thwarting his plans in time.

"The Communists of the capitalist countries are not sufficiently prepared for *abrupt* turns of events and have not yet mastered the forms of struggle dictated by the tense international situation." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The World Communist Movement,* p. 49, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

He said all of this, while emphasizing the unforgettable help which the Communist movement had rendered the Spanish people in their glorious struggle for freedom.

The question which we must necessarily ask ourselves is this: have we done all in our power to profit fully by these invaluable criticisms of Comrade Manuilsky? That we have profited some, goes without saying; but not enough. Had we realized the crucial and vital importance of the observation that Communists in the capitalist countries "have still a poor grasp of Stalin's great art of foreseeing events," that they "are not sufficiently prepared for abrupt turns of events" and that they "have not yet mastered the forms of struggle dictated by the tense international situation"—had we understood fully the seriousness of such weaknesses, we would have fought harder and unceasingly for the Bolshevization of our Party, attaining a greater mastery of Stalin's art of leadership. We would have been able to see *farther* and to *forecast* events and to prepare the masses more effectively for the changed conditions and tasks.

In discussing Stalin's art to foresee and forecast we are discussing a fundamental requisite of Bolshevization and Bolshevik leadership. We are discussing the *mastery* of the Marxist-Leninist theory. Nothing less than that. We are also discussing the nature of the *power* of that theory. And of this power, the conclusion of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* has this to say:

"The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* p. 355, International Publishers, New York.)

The central idea here is to foresee the course of events. Herein lies the power of the Marxist-Leninist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory. Does that mean to perceive only how and in what direction these events are developing in the *present?* No, it means not only that. It means to perceive how and in what direction these current events *are bound to develop in the future.*

In other words: the imperialist war between the Anglo-French bloc and Germany, the mere fact that such a war was in progress in the first days of last September, had to lead us directly to the realization that:

"The imperialist war is calling forth a regrouping of the class forces in the capitalist countries. In the camp of the bourgeoisie, the group interests of its different sections are receding before the common class interests of the bourgeoisie. The previously existing division into various opposing groups, into more reactionary and less reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie, is yielding place to their common interest in conducting the war and preserving capitalism. 'National Unity' is being established from the extreme reactionary to the extreme 'Left' wing of the bourgeoisie, including the top leaders of the petty bourgeois parties. But at the same time the other pole is witnessing the beginning of the accelerated departure of the war-ruined masses from the position of support for bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties to the position of struggle against the imperialist war and against the bourgeoisie waging it." (Georgi Dimitroff, *The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries,* pp. 13-14, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

From the existing situation of an imperialist war, and the events directly flowing from it, Dimitroff here shows how and in what direction these events are bound to develop in the future. His complete analysis goes farther than that. But for the immediate purpose of discussion, the central idea is that "the imperialist war is calling forth a regrouping of class forces" of a certain kind and of a certain direction. This we had to grasp at once. And, from that, to proceed to discover more particularly the specific forms and tempos of this regrouping of class forces in the United States, a non-belligerent imperialist country, with its special peculiarities and characteristics.

Hence, it is clear that, because we did not directly and fully grasp the process of a new regrouping of class forces, how and in what direction it was bound to develop in the future, we did not see far enough and did not forecast the development of these events, including those that relate to the changed position of the Roosevelt Administration. We did not fully grasp or anticipate the character and *implications* of the imperialist war.

Is that a serious matter for a Communist Party, the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and its allies? Crucially important, as it follows from Comrade Browder's report, from the deliberations and decisions of the February meeting of the Communist Party National Committee. This crucially important weakness was, however, soon recognized by us, and unitedly the Party and its leadership set to work to overcoming it. And the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

positive and significant results of this work are for everybody in the country to see. That's why the February meeting of the Communist National Committee was able to say:

"In this turning point in world history, the Communist Party of the United States, true to its class —the working class—loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism and the cause of socialism, alone of all political parties and groups in this country, correctly estimated the character of the war and gave a bold lead to the working class. To the toiling masses it was able to point the way in the struggle against the imperialist war, for keeping America out of this war, and for combating the predatory policies of American imperialism. In the face of unprecedented attacks intended to isolate and destroy the Communist Party —the vanguard of the working class—the Communist Party of the United States maintained and strengthened its contact with the masses. It consolidated its ranks. It advanced its work among the masses. It stands stronger and more united around the banner of Marxism-Leninism. The Party was able to do this because, in a Bolshevik manner, it overcame a certain slowness in readjusting itself to the new situation, especially with regard to the changed policy and imperialist role of the Roosevelt Administration." ("Resolution Adopted by the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., on the Political Situation." *The Communist*, March, 1940, p. 217.)

The Party was able to do all of this, to unfold an increasingly effective struggle against Social-Democratism in all its forms and varieties, against the agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the labor movement, against Norman Thomasism, the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, because *"we have demonstrated the achievement of a unity of a Bolshevik character in our Party,"* because that unity is *"unshakable and unbreakable."* (Browder.)

It is this unshakable and unbreakable unity of our Party, always with the masses and at the head of them, moved by our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, determined to grasp Stalin's great art of leadership, of foreseeing events, determined to wage an unceasing struggle for the Bolshevization of our Party, ridding ourselves of opportunism and sectarianism—it is with all this that we shall proceed to make our National Convention a significant milestone on the historic road of the American working class to complete victory over imperialism, imperialist war, reaction and capitalism.

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOLSHEVIZATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE IMPERIALIST WAR

TOWARD THE PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

BY GENE DENNIS

I

THE outbreak of the present imperialist war confronted the American working class and its Communist vanguard with tasks of historic importance. The realization of these tasks, which are set forth in the October and February resolutions of our Political and National Committees and are further clarified and deepened in Comrade Dimitroff's pamphlet, *The War and the Working Class in the Capitalist Countries*,* constitute a major Bolshevik test for our Party.

To what extent has our Party stood this test? How successful have we been in reconstructing our policies and tactics in accordance with the changing international and national situation, on the basis of our main strategical line and aims? What lessons can we draw from the achievements and the shortcomings in our policies and mass work since the war began? What must be done to Bolshevize further our Party, to equip our Party to move forward still more rapidly and effectively along the Bolshevik path which it is following?

During the first eight months of the war, the Communist Party of the United States of America, like the majority of the sections of the Communist International, has proved more than ever that it is the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, that it defends and champions the immediate and the fundamental class interests of the proletariat, that it is loyal to the cause of proletarian internationalism and socialism, that it is guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. And because of this, our Party, in the main, despite a number of serious weaknesses, is proving equal to the new responsibilities which the war has placed before our class and our Party.

The Communist Party alone of all American political parties and labor organizations was the first to analyze the imperialist character of the war. We were the first to proclaim that the war is a predatory

* Published by Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and unjust war between rival imperialist powers for a new redivision of the earth, for world domination—that it is a war which the working class and toiling people should not and cannot support. Moreover, we were the first to show that our own bourgeoisie and government share the responsibility for the war together with the bourgeoisie of all capitalist countries, in the first place with the ruling circles in the belligerent states.

It was our Party, and our Party alone, which forecast and signalized the increasingly aggressive, imperialist war policies being unfolded by American finance capital and its government. We unmasked, and are mobilizing labor and the toilers as a whole to combat vigorously, the war aims of American imperialism and the Roosevelt Administration which are designed to prolong and extend the imperialist war so as to secure enormous war profits for the big monopolists and to strengthen the imperialist positions and world hegemony of the United States at the expense of its chief imperialist rivals: Great Britain, Japan and Germany, at the expense of the colonies and weaker nations, especially in Latin America and the Far East, and, above all, at the expense of the Soviet Union and the working class and toilers of the United States and all countries. In line with this we have exposed and are organizing the working people to resist firmly the policies of the economic royalists and the government which are promoting America's entry into the war on the side of the Anglo-French imperialists, under conditions and at a time most favorable to the American bourgeoisie, and which include as a central objective the organization of a new anti-Soviet war front and the transformation of the imperialist war into a united imperialist military crusade against the U.S.S.R.

On the basis of the new international situation brought about by the imperialist war, our Party likewise correctly evaluated the changing political alignments within the country. Early in the war we estimated, among other developments, the changed role of the Roosevelt Administration and the dominant circles of the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party. We pointed out their steady abandonment of the progressive features of the New Deal social and labor legislation and their reactionary, warmongering, anti-Soviet orientation in foreign and domestic affairs. We foretold this and are rallying the masses against the imperialist policies of the Roosevelt Government and of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties because we correctly understood that: "In the camp of the bourgeoisie, the group interests of their different sections are receding before the common class interests of the bourgeoisie." (Dimitroff.) We showed further, in view of the common interests of the "liberal" bourgeoisie, including the leading Roosevelt Democrats, and the most aggressive monopolists in prosecuting the war aims of American imperialism and in preserving capitalism, that the Roosevelt Administration and Wall Street were and are endeavoring to estab-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish "national unity" of the bourgeoisie as a class, including its major parties and the bourgeois democrats, together with the majority of the top leaders of Social-Democracy and the social reformist trade unions, particularly of the American Federation of Labor.

In accordance with this fundamentally changed situation, our Party effected a tactical reorientation in order that the working class, including its Communist vanguard, could solve the new tasks placed before it. Here the central question was and is that of uniting the working class and its allies, the toiling farmers and exploited city middle class, under proletarian leadership, against the imperialist war, reaction and capitalist exploitation. That is why our Party brought forward the need of, and is waging today a consistent struggle for, forging working class unity and a broad people's front movement *in a new way*. For today, the united proletarian front can only be achieved successfully if working class unity is built *primarily from below*, on a class struggle basis, and is consistently directed against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction, against the bourgeoisie *and* against the agents of and capitulators to imperialism *within* the labor movement. This requires in the first place, as emphasized by our Party, a sharper and more resolute struggle against the leaders, ideology and influence of Social-Democratism within the ranks of labor.

Similarly, to strengthen and extend the people's front movement under the new conditions it was and is necessary, as our Party is endeavoring, to build the people's front in a new way, against the American bourgeoisie *and* the Roosevelt Administration, and against the pro-war "liberals," the treacherous leaders of Social-Democracy and of the American Federation of Labor.

Moreover, whereas before the war, the working class played an influential role in the democratic front movement, and it was necessary to strengthen its hegemony, today in the developing anti-imperialist people's front movement it is absolutely essential, as we Communists project, that *the leading role* shall be secured and exercised by the working class, that labor shall display the greatest political initiative and firmly establish its independent political leadership within the people's front.

Corresponding to this new tactical approach to the cardinal questions of the united and people's front and taking into account that the Roosevelt Democrats as well as the Garner Democrats and the Republicans are aggressively carrying out the policies of the imperialist bourgeoisie—our Party developed further the tactic of independent political action. It stressed the need of, and is working to promote, the political independence of labor as a *class* and the complete political, ideological and organizational separation of the working people from the two-party system. It emphasized that the working class and its allies cannot support either the Democratic or the Republican Parties and that in the crucial 1940

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elections labor in alliance with the exploited farmers, city middle classes and the Negro people should build an anti-imperialist people's front movement, and should orientate itself upon establishing a new mass party of the people—an anti-imperialist peace party, an anti-war farmer-labor party. It further emphasized that in order effectively to advance the movement for independent political action and the building of a powerful people's front from below against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction it is essential to strengthen our Party politically and organizationally, to strengthen its independent policy and role in the labor and anti-war mass movement, in the struggle for peace, for security and for socialism.

The events of the first eight months of the war have amply confirmed the correctness of the Party's policy and new tactics. Today, under the guidance of the National Committee and our leaders, Comrades Browder and Foster, our Party stands in the forefront of the struggle to end the imperialist war, to keep America out of it, to protect the economic standards and civil liberties of the people, to secure peace for the people and to do away with the causes responsible for imperialist war. In the labor, youth and broad anti-war mass movements our Party played and is playing a more leading and influential role. It has stimulated and contributed to the strengthening of the working class, politically and organizationally, to its growing political maturity and leadership in the anti-war movement and the political affairs of our country. In making the tactical reorientation required by the new conditions, our Party has consolidated and broadened its ties with the masses and is expanding its mass work. Moreover, our Party, on the whole, is meeting the sharpening attacks on its rights and legality, firmly and courageously, with the entire Party from top to bottom united around its national leadership and the Communist International more solidly and staunchly than ever before.

II

In analyzing the policy and activities of the Party since the outbreak of the war it is also imperative to consider the shortcomings and errors in our work. Only through a self-critical examination of these can we draw the necessary lessons from our experiences and equip our Party and the working class to solve more quickly and effectively the new tasks which history has placed before us.

Therefore, while evaluating the correct political line of the Party and studying the progress which has been and is being made in carrying out the new tactics, we must likewise take into account a number of serious weaknesses and mistakes which have been committed, as well as certain opportunist tendencies expressed in specific phases of our current work. Among these, the following merit special consideration:

In the first days, immediately following the outbreak of the war, our Party was somewhat slow in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fully drawing the main conclusions from the new international and national situation, in reorientating itself. This was shown by the plenum of our National Committee on September 1-3, 1939, which did not completely and decisively estimate the new situation nor project all the major new tasks confronting the working class and our Party. It was not until September 19 that our National Committee in its statement of that date,* fully and clearly analyzed the war as an imperialist war, as an unjust war.

Moreover in the first days of the war we did not adequately understand the significance of the so-called neutrality position of the American bourgeoisie and the government, nor the changed role and the increasingly aggressive imperialist policies of the Roosevelt Administration. Because of this, sections of our Party were slow to take into account the new regrouping of class forces within the country, and the need for adopting a different tactical position towards Roosevelt and the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party in view of their reactionary and warmongering course in the new situation. Consequently, some comrades were slow in understanding that to conduct an uncompromising struggle against the imperialist war, reaction and capitalism, and against our own imperialist bourgeoisie, it was and is imperative from the very outbreak of the war that our Party, the working class and its allies resist and combat the imperialist war plans and policies of the Roosevelt Government in both the foreign and domestic arena. Our Political Committee, through its resolution of October 13,* corrected these opportunist views, rectified the Party's weaknesses and errors in line with our generally correct political orientation and mapped out a clear-cut and decisive policy and tactical line on *all* major questions and issues.

Since October 13, while the Party in the main has carried out a correct policy, has made and is making substantial advances in the practical application of its main political line, experience has shown that opportunist tendencies of both a Right and "Left" character still exist and still exert a certain harmful influence in a number of Party organizations, and still need to be combated and overcome.

In several state organizations a certain hesitancy and moments of vacillation were exhibited in helping to reorientate our comrades in the trade unions on the third-term question, in New York, for example. Not everywhere has our Party displayed the necessary resoluteness and political initiative in applying the united and people's front tactics in a new way in accordance with the existing wide possibilities, in promoting independent labor political action, in gauging the rapidity of the shift of important and large sections of the working class, the youth and the farmers away from the influence of Roose-

* "Keep America Out of the Imperialist War," *The Communist*, October, 1939, p. 899.

* "America and the International Situation," *The Communist*, November, 1939, p. 995.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

velt and the former New Dealers. In most Party organizations there still exists a gross underestimation of the influence of Social-Democratism and the need of waging a more determined and concrete struggle against the ideology and policies of class collaboration, social reformism and social chauvinism, and for exposing and isolating, not only the Thomases and the Waldmans, but also the Hillmans and the Dubinskys, as well as the Lovestoneite and Trotskyite agents of imperialism. In connection with the sharpening attacks against the labor movement and the Communist Party it is also necessary to record the existence of certain legalistic illusions and tendencies, especially in the early days of the war, and the extreme slowness with which many districts moved, and are still moving, to safeguard and readjust the form and methods of work of the Party organizations to the changing situation.

But simultaneous with this, there must also be noted the tendency in certain Party organizations to confuse and substitute essential measures for protecting the Party and assuring its continued functioning under all conditions, with a lessening of the independent mass work of our Party, with an inability correctly to combine all the various forms and methods of mass work, with an underestimation of the heightened militancy and political consciousness of the working class and the toilers and the possibilities for effectively defending the civil liberties of the working class and its Communist vanguard. Other sectarian manifestations, principally of a "Leftist" character, have developed, such as inclinations to exaggerate and overestimate the scope and the level of the movement of the masses away from Roosevelt and the two-party system; the failure sufficiently to link up and combine the Party's mass agitation and propaganda against the imperialist war and Roosevelt's war-and-hunger program, as well as the organization of the anti-war mass movement, with the organization and leadership of the struggle for the immediate economic and political demands of the workers, the toiling farmers, the youth, women and the Negro people. There are also certain tendencies within the Party to lump together the lower trade union functionaries of the A. F. of L. with its reactionary top officialdom, as well as to minimize the urgency and the possibilities of patiently explaining and trying to win over to the anti-imperialist people's front movement those sections of the working class, toiling farmers, intellectuals and exploited middle class elements—honest opponents of imperialism and war—who have been momentarily confused by the class enemy, who have temporarily succumbed to the influences of an oversimplified anti-fascist ideology and the "save-democracy" demagogy of the Anglo-French-American imperialists.

On the basic question of popularizing and organizing mass support for the peace policy of the Soviet Union, a number of serious weaknesses must also be noted and likewise quickly eliminated. One is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain stereotyped and doctrinaire approach frequently reflected in our press and speeches in which the historic role and achievements of the U.S.S.R. as the world citadel of peace, liberty and socialism is frequently dealt with as something separate and apart from the interests, needs and problems of the American working class and toiling people. On the other hand, in certain Party circles, there is a gross underestimation of the mounting political influence and tremendous authority which the Soviet Union enjoys among the American working people. There is not a full appreciation of the increased understanding of the workers and toilers regarding the socialist peace policy of the U.S.S.R. and how this directly and immeasurably prevents the spread of the imperialist war, increases the possibilities for helping to keep the United States out of the war, strengthens the struggle to end the war and bring peace to the peoples and remove the causes which engender wars, oppression and exploitation—capitalism. Because of this, many Party organizations neglect or are reluctant to develop a mass campaign and movement in the trade unions and other mass organizations in support of the peace moves and aims of the Soviet Union, on the basis of promoting the national and social security of the American working people, of safeguarding the fundamental interests of the American and international working class. Moreover it must be recognized that some Party leaders in state organizations frequently get so bogged down in routine matters and day-to-day practical organizational problems that they often fail to grasp the historic successes of the U.S.S.R. and its foreign policy, such as in relation to the Soviet-Finnish peace treaty, and the *practical* consequences which this has for the American working class and, for instance, its fight for peace.

Furthermore, it is also imperative to call attention to another weakness in our work in the present situation, to those tendencies towards oversimplifying problems, towards schematicism. For example, in connection with the imperialist war and the sharpening of the inter-imperialist contradictions, especially Anglo-American contradictions, a number of incorrect viewpoints have been advanced. In the Party press a number of articles have appeared tending to overemphasize these imperialist antagonisms, to deal with them in a one-sided fashion, out of all relation to other developments and to the fundamental contradiction of modern history: the struggle between the two systems, between dying capitalism and rising, liberating socialism. Whereas the *Daily Worker* in several of its editorials tended to underestimate the significance of the inter-imperialist contradictions, especially the growing antagonisms between the Anglo-American and the Japanese-American imperialists, which have been rendered more acute by the imperialist war. To underestimate the importance of the inter-imperialist contradictions means, among other things, not sufficiently to take into account

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how these antagonisms can and are being utilized by the international working class and its proletarian state in its own interests, in the cause of peace and socialism. It also means to neglect, for instance, adequately to emphasize how today in the United States the working class can utilize these contradictions further to expose the imperialist character of the war and as an "indirect reserve" for helping to hinder and frustrate the war policy and machinations of our own imperialist bourgeoisie. Other tendencies of a similar type have been expressed in our press, such as those in connection with the war aims of American imperialism, the Welles mission, etc. These have sometimes been presented non-dialectically, in a one-sided manner, in such a way as to lose sight of the many-sided aspects of the independent policies and aims of Wall Street and the government. The objective result of this is to tend to weaken, momentarily at least, the struggle against American imperialism on one or several sectors, *i.e.*, in respect to its policy in the Far East, or Latin America, etc.

The question naturally arises: why these mistakes and weaknesses? Why, at times, is the correct political line of our Party and its National Committee distorted and incorrectly applied? In a general way it is because our Party has not sufficiently mastered the theory of Marxism-Leninism. It is because while our Party has made and is making great advances towards becoming a Bolshevik Party, it is still *in the process of* becoming a Bolshevik organization.

Among the more immediate related factors and reasons which contributed to the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Party's work in the first days after the outbreak of the war, and to the inability of our Party more rapidly to readjust and reorientate its tactical line, suffice it to note the following:

First, it is clear that we did not study deeply and thoroughly enough the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* which was published early in 1939, especially those sections concerning the Marxist-Leninist teachings on just and unjust wars and the lessons of the World War and the beginnings of the second imperialist war. We did not adequately draw the main political conclusions from the historical path followed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to help master and solve our own problems. We did not completely grasp the significance of the teachings of the *History* nor utilize these as a Marxist-Leninist compass for guiding our Party in the midst of the profound changes which were and are taking place in the international situation and within the country. Similarly, we failed to grasp fully the lessons for the international proletariat, and for our own working class and Party, from the historic Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held in March, 1939; especially is this true in relation to Comrade Stalin's report*

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his analysis of the changing international situation. Likewise on the very eve of the outbreak of the imperialist war in Central Europe, we did not heed the timely warning to the workers of the world regarding the war plans of Anglo-French imperialism as analyzed in Comrade Zhdanov's article in *Pravda* in August, 1939, in connection with the negotiations between the Red Army staff and the British-French military mission. And especially were we slow in appreciating the historic significance of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact and the maturing changes on the international arena which this expressed and foretold.

Secondly, we must recognize that in boldly and effectively applying the line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in overcoming the opportunist, sectarian position and policies which formerly dominated the work and life of our Party, our Party did not sufficiently combat certain Right tendencies that developed precisely in the period during which we made the greatest headway in pursuing the tactics of the united working class front and the anti-fascist democratic front. These, as signalized by Comrade Manuilsky at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, consisted principally in "a tendency to minimize the importance of the struggle against the capitulators, to idealize the role of the so-called democratic states, and to gloss over their imperialist character." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The World Communist Movement*, p. 48, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

These Right opportunist tendencies led, among other things, to a certain one-sided estimate of the role and policies of the Roosevelt Administration and the so-called New Deal; and this, together with the tendency to oversimplify our anti-fascist slogans, contributed to the slowness in estimating the "neutrality" program and the changed position of the Roosevelt Administration and in completing our tactical reorientation in September, 1939.

Thirdly, the fact that in the past we have not always exercised sufficient Bolshevik self-criticism in our work has hindered at times a searching evaluation of *all* phases of our Party's work and tactics, including its connection with the above-mentioned points. This tended to create certain unnecessary difficulties in solving the weaknesses and errors arising during the first phase of our work after the outbreak of the war.

Today, as correctly noted in the February plenum of our National Committee, our Party is overcoming its mistakes and shortcomings while steadfastly and effectively organizing and leading the struggle against the imperialist war, reaction and capitalism. We are learning, as never before, that:

". . . a party is invincible if it does not fear criticism and self-criticism, if it does not gloss over the mistakes and defects in its work, if it teaches and educates its cadres by drawing the lessons from the mistakes in Party work, and if it knows how to correct its mistakes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in time." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 361, International Publishers, New York.)

This is why today more than at any other time in our history we must self-critically evaluate our work and learn from our mistakes as well as our achievements. The lessons we can draw from the fact that we have corrected most of our mistakes *in time* are invaluable. Through the further development of Bolshevik self-criticism and self-correction we can more rapidly overcome existing opportunist tendencies and can better equip our Party for the new and more complex conditions and tasks with which the changing political situation will confront the working class and our Party.

III

What is needed to ensure the further and most rapid Bolshevization of our Party? This is to master completely the principles of Marxism-Leninism which have exercised and played the guiding role in the development and growing political maturity of our Party. These are the principles which characterize the history and work of the glorious Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin and are set forth by Comrade Stalin in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* These are the principles outlined by Stalin in *Pravda** in 1925 in an article dealing with Bolshevization. In this article, Stalin emphasized the following "basic conditions without which the Bolshevization of the Communist Parties is impossible in general":

"1. The parties must not regard themselves as an appendage of the parliamentary election machine, as the Social-Democratic Parties in fact do, and not as a free supplement to the trade unions, as certain anarcho-syndicalists sometimes assert, but as the *highest* form of class combination of the proletariat, designed to *lead* all other forms of proletarian organization, from the trade unions to the parliamentary groups."

This teaches us that today more than ever we must create within our Party a deeper understanding of the *vanguard role* of the Communist Party. This requires that we strengthen the Party politically and organizationally, pursue *at all times* an *independent policy* and expand the *independent* mass work of the Party on all fronts, as well as overcome any tendencies to lose or submerge the identity of the Party in the mass movements. This means to consolidate and broaden our ties with the masses, to promote the political independence of the working class as a *class,* and to work in such a way as to merit the *fullest confidence* of the working people, thereby helping to win and ensure the leading role of our Party in the developing united proletarian front and in the anti-imperialist people's front. This means to improve our day-to-day work in organizing and leading the workers and toilers in all phases of the struggle against the impe-

* Quoted by Georgi Dimitroff in *The Communist International*, No. 1, 1940, p. 18.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rialist war, reaction and capitalist exploitation, in defense of their immediate and fundamental class interests. This means further to overcome any tendencies towards becoming immersed in routine practical work, in one-sided activities in the mass organizations, and never to lose sight of the historical perspectives of the working class movement and the urgent problem of mobilizing and guiding the working class and its allies forward to solve the maturing new tasks.

"2. The Party, especially its leading elements, must have fully mastered the revolutionary theory of Marxism, which is indissolubly connected with revolutionary practice."

This necessitates that the entire Party from top to bottom focus the necessary attention upon mastering the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as a "guide to action"; that we constantly strive *independently to work out Marxist theory* in connection with the specific features of American political problems and developments; and that we study Marxism-Leninism, especially the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, as Comrade Stalin counseled the Bolsheviks to study Lenin: "to study Lenin, not from isolated quotations, but the substance of his work, to study him seriously and thoughtfully."

"3. The Party must base its slogans and directions not on formulas and historical parallels learned by rote, but on a careful analysis of the concrete conditions of the revolutionary movement at home and abroad, in which the experience of revolution in all countries must absolutely be taken into account."

This particularly requires that in the present changing situation we be vigilantly on guard to "overcome the burden of out-of-date tactical lines which have become a brake on the movement," that we put forward slogans of action that correspond to the concrete situation, and that we avoid any tendencies towards schematicism and one-sidedness in appraising developments and determining our tactics.

"4. The Party must test the slogans and directives in the fire of the revolutionary struggle of the masses."

This means today more than ever we must examine and verify our slogans and work in the light of events and the experiences of the labor and anti-war movements, and that we must more widely popularize our slogans and new tactics, such as the question of forging an anti-imperialist farmer-labor party, and make these *the property of the masses.*

"5. The whole work of the Party, especially if it has not yet rid itself of Social-Democratic traditions, must be reconstructed on a new, revolutionary footing, so designed that every step and every action of the Party should naturally lead to revolutionizing the masses, to training and educating the working class masses in the spirit of revolution."

This requires today, among other

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things, that we systematically endeavor to direct the anti-war and anti-imperialist sentiments and movements against the bourgeoisie and its government, against the capitalist system—the source of imperialist wars, oppression and exploitation; that we utilize, for instance, the struggle for the defense of civil liberties and trade union rights not only to protect and extend the rights for the masses, but also in order to expose the reactionary character of bourgeois democracy, in order to combat political reaction and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, whatever its forms, in order to advance the movement for proletarian democracy, for socialism. And to do this, to wage an effective struggle against the imperialist war, reaction and capitalist exploitation, it is essential that we conduct an uncompromising and more effective struggle against Social-Democratism, against the parties and leaders of Social-Democracy, against the ideology and influences of Social-Democracy which is the chief agency and instrument of the bourgeoisie and its imperialist policies within the ranks of the labor movement.

"6. The Party in its work must be able to combine supreme fidelity to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism!) with maximum connection and contact with the masses (not to be confused with tail-endism!), without which it is impossible for the Party not only to teach the masses but also to learn from them, not only to lead the masses and raise them to the level of the Party but also to take heed of the voice of the masses and divine their urgent needs."

In the present situation this requires, in part, that our Party combine the most consistent and uncompromising struggle against the imperialist war and the bourgeoisie, against the capitulators to Roosevelt and the other warmongers, against the Social-Democratic and the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite agents of imperialism, with the most extensive and systematic mass work, patiently to "explain, explain and once again explain the real state of affairs to the masses." This also means that we must continuously strengthen our ties with the working people, especially with the workers in the basic industries, and learn from the masses, from the changing developments within the labor and anti-war mass movements, particularly taking into account and drawing the necessary lessons from such developments as the "Yanks Are Not Coming" movement and the specific features of the current movement for independent political action.

"7. The Party must be able in its work to combine an irreconcilable revolutionary spirit (not to be confused with revolutionary adventurism!) with the maximum flexibility and maneuvering ability (not to be confused with opportunism!), without which it is impossible for the Party to master all forms of struggle and organization, to link up the day-to-day interests of the proletariat with the fundamental interests of the proletarian revolution, and to combine the legal struggle with the illegal struggle."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This signifies that every Party organization should strive to link up more effectively its everyday mass work in defense of the immediate economic and political demands of the workers and toilers with the broadest propaganda and mass education for our socialist aims and principles. This requires that the entire Party, in carrying out its policies and tactics, should stubbornly combat all Right and "Left" opportunist tendencies and mistakes, and should learn how to apply in all spheres of its mass activity the adherence to principles and the tactical skill in maneuvering, such as our comrades have displayed in connection with the recent developments in the broad youth movement. This further necessitates a more flexible approach and sustained attention to the problems of readjusting the organizational forms and methods of work of the Party to the changing situation, to utilizing and exploring every medium and opportunity in the localities, states, and nationally for helping advance the movement for a mass anti-war, farmer-labor party; to developing new forms and avenues for helping organize the progressive movement within the A. F. of L.

"8. The Party must not conceal its mistakes, it must not fear criticism, it must be able to improve and educate its forces using its own mistakes as an example."

In line with this cardinal Bolshevik principle, we should develop the widest, constructive self-criticism in the Party's pre-convention discussion. We should utilize this discussion and the branch, section, county, state and national conventions to examine critically how the Party organizations, committees and cadres are applying and carrying through the main political line of our Party as well as to determine what must be done by every Party committee and branch, by every Party leader and member to improve and reinforce the Party's mass work, its policies and organizations.

"9. The Party must be able to form a basic leading group of the best elements of the foremost fighters, devoted enough to be genuine spokesmen of the aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat, and experienced enough to become the real leaders of the proletarian revolution, capable of applying the tactics and strategy of Leninism."

In accord with this vital precept of Marxism-Leninism, bearing in mind the counsel of Comrade Stalin that "cadres decide everything," our Party must constantly devote the maximum attention to the solution of this problem. It is of special importance in this connection that all Party organizations and conventions should give the utmost consideration to the selection, election, training and promotion of the leading personnel of the Party, particularly of workers, women, Negroes and youth *from the decisive industries.* And the political standards by which *all* members of the branch, county, state and national committees should be selected remains and must include the Bolshevik qualities of loyalty and devotion to the working class and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Communist International; political stability and reliability; courage and staunchness in the mass struggles of the working people and under all conditions. For our cadres shall be, more than ever, people who take an irreconcilable position towards the bourgeoisie, opportunism, and all enemy influences. They shall be people who are the recognized political leaders and organizers of the workers and toilers, meriting their confidence and respect, having the capabilities for independent Communist political judgment, initiative and responsibility. These are the Bolshevik standards by which we should approach the selection and election of our leading cadres and committees, and by which we must train and educate our cadres and members.

"10. The Party must systematically improve the social composition of its organizations and rid itself of corrupting opportunist elements, with the aim of making its ranks monolithic to the utmost degree."

This means, in the first place, that we must further improve the proletarian composition of our membership and leading committees; that we must develop greater Bolshevik vigilance throughout the Party; that we must constantly verify the cadres and members of the Party on the basis of their work, their deeds as well as their words, their loyalty and actions while "under fire" and in periods of rapid political changes such as we are living through now. This requires further that everywhere in the Party we should combat more firmly any tendencies that may exist towards rotten liberalism, towards condoning or "overlooking" mistakes and weaknesses of any Party comrade, towards taking a lenient attitude towards "talented" people who have proved to be politically and personally unstable, and have lost their ties with the masses.

"11. The Party must establish iron proletarian discipline, based on ideological unanimity, clarity as to the aims of the movement, coordination of practical actions and an attitude of clear understanding on the part of the general membership towards the aims of the Party."

We already have a high degree of political unity and firm discipline in our Party. In fact, our Party is more solidly knit and united than ever before. But as recent experience has shown, such as in the days immediately following the signing of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, this unity, to a considerable degree, while based upon Party loyalty is not always combined with sufficient *political understanding* of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the tactical line of the Party. Therefore an essential prerequisite for the further development of the monolithic unity of our Party is to strengthen the working class discipline and unity of action of our Party on the basis of strengthening our Party's ideological and political work and Marxist-Leninist educational activities.

"12. The Party must keep a systematic check on the way its de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cisions and directives are being fulfilled, without which the latter risk becoming empty promises capable only of undermining the confidence of the broad proletarian masses in the Party."

In accordance with this vital principle of Leninist organization and method of Party work, it is imperative that our Party regularly verify the execution of its decisions. It is particularly urgent today, for example, that we bring about a decisive change in respect to the fulfilment of our repeated decisions regarding the development of systematic work among the toiling farmers, as well as in connection with conducting more consistent and effective activity among the A. F. of L. workers. Really to improve matters here, systematically to check and establish the necessary guarantees for the carrying out of the decisions of the Party, it is essential that throughout the Party, from top to bottom, we bring about a closer working collaboration and develop greater personal and *collective* responsibility for the making and execution of all Party decisions. This is indispensable at all times but doubly urgent today in view of the new and manifold tasks confronting our Party and the working class.

* * *

On the basis of the policies and mass work of our Party during the first eight months of the war, we can proudly state that, under the leadership of Comrades Browder and Foster, the Bolshevization of our Party advanced to a new high point, that we are really learning to be a Bolshevik Party. We are able to do this because of the correctness of our political line, the firm political unity of our Party, the readiness of our Party to correct in time and learn from its own mistakes, the strengthening bonds between our Party and the working class and toilers, the devotion of our Party to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the loyalty of our Party, our National Committee and its leaders, Comrades Browder and Foster, to the working class and the Communist International.

This is why our Party faces the future with supreme confidence. This is why our Party with still greater determination "will work with even greater energy and persistence *to put into practice in the Communist movement, Stalin's principles of Bolshevization,* without which the victory of the working class cannot be ensured." (Dimitroff.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HAYMARKET MARTYRS AND MAY DAY, 1940

BY OAKLEY JOHNSON

"My own deliberate opinion concerning this Haymarket affair is that the death-dealing missile was the work, the deliberate work of monopoly, the act of those who themselves charge us with the deed. . . . I believe that it was instigated by eastern monopolists to produce public sentiment against popular movements, especially the eight-hour movement then pending. . . ." (From Albert Parsons' defense speech, October 8, 9, 1886, before sentence of death was pronounced upon him.)

"We mean to make things over; we're tired of toil for naught
But bare enough to live on: never an hour for thought.
We want to feel the sunshine; we want to smell the flowers;
We're sure that God has willed it, and we mean to have eight hours.
We're summoning our forces from shipyard, shop, and mill:
Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest, eight hours for what we will!"

(From a contemporary poem by J. G. Blanchard.)

"On this day [May First] the workers also remind the bosses of their main demand: eight hours work, eight hours rest, and eight hours recreation. This is what the workers of other countries are demanding now." (From May Day leaflet written by Lenin in 1896, while in prison in St. Petersburg.)

* * *

AT A time when reaction is trying to browbeat American labor, to shove labor back into the servitude of half a century ago and tear from it the incomplete but highly valued fruits of class battles on the economic and political field, it is useful to look back on the brave struggle which the American working class initiated fifty-four years ago, a struggle for the eight-hour day, a work-day short enough to provide leisure for recreation and thought. The workers who fought for this shorter work-day in 1886 were taking—as the National Labor Union of the United States declared in 1866—"a step higher in the scale of moral and intellectual life."

As Marx said: "The laborer needs time for satisfying his intellectual and social wants. . . ." (*Capital*,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. I, p. 215, International Publishers, New York.)

May First, 1886, the date of the first general strike for the eight-hour day, was the culmination of a struggle for shorter hours which had been carried on by the American workers for twenty years.

"The first fruit of the Civil War," says Karl Marx, "was the eight hours' agitation, that ran with the seven-leagued boots of the locomotive from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New England to California." (*Ibid.*, p. 287.)

In Chicago, center and fount of the struggle, the police met the strike and the accompanying demonstrations with unprecedented brutality, especially in their attack on demonstrators before the McCormick Harvester Company on May 3, when workers were shot and killed in cold blood. It was at a peaceful protest meeting on the following day, near Haymarket Square, that a bomb was thrown by a never-identified person, which caused the death of several policemen. This led to a police reign of terror during which eight labor leaders were arrested without warrants, held incommunicado, falsely charged with the crime, seven of them sentenced to death by hanging, and four of them actually executed.

The significance of the struggle that culminated in the martyrdom of these men lies both in the labor movement which they led, and in labor's fight in their defense. The words, "Haymarket Martyrs," and the individual names of Spies and Parsons and others of the group, have come to symbolize the beginning of the maturing of the American working class in its conflict with the rising American capitalism, a capitalism which was already rushing headlong toward the stage of imperialism.

Haymarket is a fitting symbol of America's contribution to the world labor movement. It is inseparably associated with May Day, the international day of labor, and with the fight for the eight-hour day. The great campaign to save the lives of the Haymarket heroes helped to highlight May First as a day of labor, and to highlight the eight-hour-day plank in labor's platform.

The American workers persisted in the eight-hour-day struggle during the years immediately following 1886. The American Federation of Labor Convention of 1888 sent a message to the founding congress of the Second International which met in Paris the following year, and which called for an international demonstration of support for the American workers.

"Since a similar demonstration has already been decided upon for May 1, 1890, by the American Federation of Labor at its Convention in St. Louis, December, 1888," the International's resolution declared, "this day is accepted for the international demonstration."

To the international working-class movement the American workers contributed not only May Day and the initiating of the eight-hour-day movement; they also organized the first workers' party, the Workingmen's Party, in Philadelphia, in May, 1828, and initiated

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what became known as International Women's Day in New York in 1908. When we consider further that American trade unionists were represented by a delegate to the First International, and that Karl Marx published articles in American newspapers and corresponded with an American president, we can see that the revolutionary socialist movement is firmly rooted in the history and thought of the American working class.*

The Haymarket martyrs, chief of whom were Albert Parsons, native-born descendant of an immigrant who came over in the Mayflower in 1620; and August Spies, German-born immigrant, who came to this country at the age of sixteen in 1871, symbolize in their persons the Americanism of the struggle for working-class emancipation—the Americanism born of the melting-pot and of the descendants of the Revolution.

The Story of Haymarket

The nationwide May Day strike of 1886, which was most successful and most aggressive in Chicago, and which was the immediate occasion for the Haymarket provocation and the struggle which succeeded it, had itself been specifically planned for nearly two years. On October 7, 1884, the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada (which had been formed in 1881, and later changed its name to the American Federation of Labor), passed a resolution "that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's labor from May First, 1886," and called upon other labor organizations to adopt principles "to conform to this resolution." At its 1885 convention, it repeated this resolution, and called for supporting actions. Other unions took up this stand, which had been popularized and fought for by labor organizations for a score of years. The *Alarm,* edited by Albert Parsons, and the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (*Workers' Times),* edited by August Spies, the leading Left-wing papers of Chicago, and indeed of the entire country, printed the Federation's call in their columns in August, 1885, and campaigned actively for it from then on.

When the long-planned day arrived, workers in every industrial center in the country downed tools in demand for the eight-hour day. Statistics show that over half a million men in the country at large went out on strikes involving 11,562 establishments. In Chicago alone, where some twenty-five unions were involved, 40,000 workers went out on strike.

"Every railroad in the city was crippled, all the freight houses were closed and barred, and most of the industries of Chicago were paralyzed. The situation was tense."

Such is the description by Harvey Wish, in the *Journal of the*

* We may add such facts as the existence of the Communist Club of New York before the Civil War, the impressive number of outstanding Marxians who fought on the Northern side in the Civil War, the correspondence of Marx and Engels with American labor leaders, and the first publication anywhere of the *Eighteenth Brumaire,* in New York, 1852. (One of the Americans with whom Marx corresponded was F. A. Sorge, who personally donated several of the thirty English titles on the Haymarket affair to be found in the New York Public Library.) See "Forerunners," by V. J. Jerome, *The Communist,* September, 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Illinois State Historical Society, December, 1938.

Despite predictions of trouble, the whole day passed peacefully. Workers and their families paraded through the streets in many thousands, marching in orderly columns, and met in great crowds to hear speeches by the popular working class leaders, Parsons, Spies, and their co-workers. The second day passed peacefully also. The strike was too successful, too orderly, to suit the Chicago capitalists. They gathered their forces.

The huge police contingent—with numerous Pinkertons in the background—was ready; the state militia numbering 1,350 men was on hand; and the "Citizens' Committee" of business men was holding continuous sessions from May 1 on. Every employer declared a lock-out. The newspapers used their heaviest artillery. The May 1 issue of the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, speaking of the "socialistic agitators," Spies, Parsons and the others, said, "There is one standing admonition that the wage workers should keep always in mind—'kick them out.'" The Chicago *Mail* on the same day, speaking editorially, called Parsons and Spies "two dangerous ruffians," who were "fomenting disorder." It concluded thus: "Mark them for today. Keep them in view. Hold them personally responsible for any trouble that occurs. Make an example of them if trouble does occur."

Trouble occurred on May 3. At the McCormick Harvester factory on that day, where 1,400 men were on strike, 300 scabs guarded by from 350 to 500 police had been imported and put to work. When the strikers demonstrated against the scabs, the police fired without warning and killed and wounded a large number.

This barbarous act, by a police force already sufficiently hated for its extreme anti-labor brutality, aroused wide indignation. Quickly circulars were printed and distributed calling for a meeting in Haymarket Square the very next day —May 4—to protest the savagery of the police. More than a thousand people—men, women and children —gathered at an end of the square, and Spies, Parsons and Samuel Fielden, in this order, addressed the crowd, condemning the police, warning against violence, and urging firmness and organization in continuing the strike. With Parsons were his wife and two children. The mayor, Carter H. Harrison, attended the meeting from its opening up till ten o'clock, listening to all three speakers, and testified later that the meeting and the speeches were orderly. When he left,* Fielden was on the point of winding up his speech, and two-thirds of the crowd had left to go home. There was every indication of an uneventful mass meeting, within a few minutes of its end—when the police appeared. Armed and marching in military fashion, one hundred sixty-seven strong, they came on the scene as soon as the mayor was out of sight, under

* On his way, according to *Reminiscences of the Anarchist Case* by Sigmund Zeisler, the mayor stopped and told Captain Bonfield that, since the meeting was quiet, the police should be "released for their ordinary duties."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the command of the hated Captain John Bonfield, ordered the dwindling crowd to "disperse," and called on bystanders to "assist." As though at a signal, a bomb was thrown toward the police, and its explosion killed one policeman instantly, wounded five others so severely that they died later, and inflicted less serious wounds on some half a hundred more.

What followed is history. The police fired on the crowd, chasing, clubbing and shooting down workers. Some were killed (how many is unknown), many wounded.

Haymarket Aftermath: Bourgeois Revenge

The next day the preparations for capitalist revenge on the workers for demanding the eight-hour day went forward rapidly. The howls of the press aroused a lynch hysteria. Hundreds were arrested. "Homes were invaded without warrant," says Harvey Wish, "and ransacked for evidence; suspects were beaten and subjected to the 'third degree'; individuals ignorant of the meaning of socialism and anarchism were tortured by the police, sometimes bribed as well, to act as witnesses for the state." The Chicago chief of police, Captain Frederick Ebersold, personally beat up Spies when the latter was arrested, until others intervened.

None of the "suspects" finally selected for trial—the eight labor leaders most hated by the employers—was at the Haymarket meeting when the bomb was thrown, except Fielden, who was speaking. They were all accused of murder, but not of throwing the bomb; they were alleged to be murderers on the grounds that the unknown bomb-thrower was influenced by their speeches and writings.

The verdict which was rendered the following December was actually drawn up on May 5, 1886, before the trial, by Melville E. Stone, editor of the *Daily News,* in consultation with the city attorney, Fred S. Winston, and the state prosecutor, Julius S. Grinnell.* The trial itself did not begin until June 21.

The trial was a travesty of a trial; Judge Joseph E. Gary conducted the trial "with singular disregard for civil guarantees," to use the careful statement of academic research investigators. Years afterward, in attempting to defend himself against indignant critics, he inadvertently condemned himself in the words—"if I had a little *strained the law,* . . . I was to be commended for my so doing." (His article in *Century* magazine, April, 1893. My emphasis.—*O.J.*) The jury was packed, as Governor John P. Altgeld showed later, in his statement upon pardoning the survivors. The witnesses for the State were the police and their bribed tools. Gary's charge to the jury was a masterpiece of prejudice, a monstrous demand for blood.

In Parsons' defense speech during the trial, he charged the employers with the bomb-throwing crime, which he said had been committed with the purpose of discrediting the eight-hour-day move-

* See *The History of the Haymarket Affair,* by Henry David, p. 227.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. The suspicious conduct of the police after the mayor's departure, the total lack of motive for their dispersal order, the entire setting and background of the deed, bear out Parsons' statement. Among the workers of Chicago at the time, as Edward Aveling and Eleanor Marx Aveling (who visited the United States during the trial) reported in the English workers' organ, *Today*, November, 1887, "the feeling was very general that it [the bomb] was thrown by an agent of the police. . . ."

Even more conclusive is the testimony of Chief of Police Ebersold concerning Captain Michael J. Schaack, one of Captain Bonfield's closest co-workers on the police force, given in an interview with the Chicago *Daily News*, May 10, 1889: "After we got the anarchist societies broken up, Schaack wanted to send out men to again organize new societies right away." This incontrovertible testimony concerning a member of his own force reveals the police officials as provocateurs. Certainly, men like Bonfield and Schaack,* in collaboration with Pinkertons, were fully capable of plotting the throwing of a bomb.

The court's sentence of death for seven of the eight men (one, Oscar Neebe, whom the court had extreme difficulty in connecting with the case at all, was given fifteen years) was set for December 3, 1886. The defense appealed, and the State Supreme Court, unable to ignore completely the trial's open irregularities, pointed out to the lower court what these "irregularities" were and how to correct them, and then confirmed the verdict.*

As the *Enquirer*, a Chicago labor paper, said at the time, "The evidence manufactured by the detectives to obtain a conviction in the lower 'court' did not satisfy the higher court, and dutifully the latter furnished what was lacking." The defense tried to appeal the case to the United States Supreme Court,** but that august tribunal, as it did later in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, refused to review it. The execution was now set for November 11, 1887. One of the younger defendants, Louis Lingg, committed suicide (or was murdered by police guards). Samuel Fielden and Michael Schwab were granted commutation of sentence to life imprisonment. Parsons and Spies, with George Engel and Adolph Fischer, were hanged.

The conduct of all eight of the men during the entire time was supremely high-minded and courageous. Their speeches at the trial are imperishable classics of proletarian literature, and reveal these men as far-sighted heroes of the working class.

They fought capitalism to the last. On the very scaffold at which their lives were snuffed out, they proudly defied their tormentors and

* Schaack, it is now known, was being paid extra money by worried Chicago employers to watch the anarchists!

* In ruling on the appeal, the Illinois Supreme Court defined Socialist principles as the advocacy of theft of property, hence a juror was entitled to prejudice against Socialists!

** In this final appeal for a new trial, the Honorable Leonard Swett, old law associate of Abraham Lincoln, joined the defense attorneys, but even his distinguished sponsorship was not enough.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affirmed their faith in the workers. Said Parsons: "Let the voice of the people be heard!" Said Spies: "There will come a time when our silence will be more powerful than the voices you strangle today."

The behavior of the bourgeoisie during this whole period and following the execution reminds one of the behavior of their French class-brothers fifteen years earlier after the crushing of the Paris Commune. Their hateful terrorizing of the worker, their glee at the legal lynching! *

Mrs. Lucy Parsons was arrested for distributing in the streets her husband's appeal to the American people.

A monument was erected at Haymarket Square *in honor of the police*, and at the unveiling on May 30, 1889, a speaker glorified the "unexcelled heroism" of the police, and extolled the judge who "held aloft, with an even poise, the scales of justice." This slimy elocutionist compared the Chicago police to the "embattled farmers of Concord" and to Leonidas' three hundred Spartans at Thermopylae. His qualifications for social analysis may be judged from his reference to "the absurd phrase, 'the conflict of capital and labor,'" and to his modest description of American poverty and riches as "disparity in conditions of life," which, he said, "seems inseparable from our imperfect humanity."

The workers' defense efforts on behalf of the eight men swelled into an international movement. The Avelings urged the British workers to "strengthen the hands of their American brethren by holding meetings and passing resolutions," and thousands did so. Among prominent Americans who protested against the legal lynching were William Dean Howells, Robert Ingersoll, Daniel De Leon, and John Brown, son of the great emancipator. In England, William Morris campaigned for the Chicago martyrs, and the young George Bernard Shaw spoke on October 14, 1887, at a defense mass meeting. A group in the French Chamber of Deputies, on October 29, telegraphed protests. Wilhelm Liebknecht was in the United States at this time, and he visited Parsons and Spies while they were in prison.

During the later struggle for amnesty for Fielden, Schwab and Neebe, many thousands from all over the world urged clemency upon Governor Richard J. Oglesby, and upon his successor, Governor Joseph Fifer, but—as in the case of Tom Mooney later—the governors refused to free the men. Fifer's successor, Governor John P. Altgeld, stern and honest young liberal, issued a pardon message on June 26, 1893, a victory at long last for the working class.* The character of Altgeld may be judged from his vigorous letter to Major

* After the lynch verdict had been announced the preceding December, the Chicago *Tribune*, according to Edward and Eleanor Marx Aveling, "proposed that $100,000 should be subscribed and presented to the jury for having done their duty."

* While the workers rejoiced, the bourgeoisie raged at the pardon. While trade unions and populists distributed 50,000 copies of the pardon message, the *New York Times* and other bourgeois papers denounced it. Theodore Roosevelt declared in 1896 that Altgeld had "condoned murder." United States Supreme Court Justice David J. Brewer violently attacked Altgeld for releasing the three labor leaders.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

R. W. McClaughry, then Chicago Chief of Police, on November 14, 1891, two years before his pardon message:

"The American people are not prepared to substitute government by police ruffians for government by law . . .," Altgeld said. "We cannot for a moment admit that by simply applying an unpopular or obloquious name to men, whether that name be anarchist or socialist . . . an officer can be justified in depriving men of rights guaranteed by the fundamental law. . . ."

The men who died on November 11, 1887, martyred by American capitalism for their defense of the American working class, did not die in vain. Even as death approached, they could taste the workers' victory.

"The direct result of our persecution," said Spies, in his *Autobiography,* taken down in prison by Nina Van Zandt and published by her, "has been—general activity in labor circles, great progress in organization and, particularly, in ideas. The radical elements have come to the front everywhere, while the conservatives were pushed to the wall. The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* has tripled its subscription list since Grinnell's [State Prosecutor Julius S. Grinnell] agitation began. At that time it had 4,000 subscribers; it has now over 10,000. The political Party* which cast over 25,000 votes last fall is also one of the many good results of Grinnell's revolutionary propaganda."

Spies' ironic reference to Grinnell as a revolutionary propagandist recalls to us today Earl Browder's ironic characterization of Judge Alfred C. Coxe, who had just sentenced Browder to four years imprisonment, as his "campaign manager" in the 14th Congressional District, New York, this past fall. The eight-hour day which the martyred leaders fought for was widely won—at least temporarily—as a result of the May First strike,* as Spies and Parsons knew before they died.

A monument to the martyred labor leaders was unveiled June 25, 1893, nearly six years after their judicial murder. But a greater monument to their memory rises ever higher and brighter in the great heart of the world's working class.

Haymarket: Landmark of Labor's First Round of Battles with Growing Monopoly

The ending of slavery by the Civil War freed as well the hands of Northern industrial capital, and at once there took place an almost unprecedented economic expansion. Capital investments in manufactures grew more than forty-fold from 1860 to 1922. Along with the increase in invested wealth went the growth in population of American cities, greatly augmented by

* This reference is clearly to the United Labor Party of Chicago, organized August 21, 1886, with a national, state and local platform, and with demands for the eight-hour day, government ownership, abolition of private police, etc. This party elected a state senator and six state representatives in Illinois, as well as candidates in other states.

* An eight-hour law for employees of the Federal Government was passed by Congress on June 25, 1868, as a result of the campaign by the National Labor Union. This small concession was largely a paper one.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immigration from foreign countries. Huge industries and huge fortunes became characteristic features of American capitalism.

The story of this expansion of capitalist economy, accompanied by increasing concentration of wealth, is largely the story of the railroads and other public utilities, of the trusts, of "political corruption." Illegal as well as legal means were utilized by America's millionaires. Exploitation, bribery, and outright robbery combined to produce the tremendous private wealth of the "Sixty Families."

The public utility corporations, such as railroad companies, city street-car, gas and electric companies, which received monopoly privileges from capitalist society, found it easy through over-capitalization and "watered stock" to get control of gigantic sums of money, which were manipulated into the hands of those who pulled the strings. That is how the Goulds and the Vanderbilts became so fabulously rich in so short a time. On top of this, the railroad corporations wangled from the government vast subsidies, in the form of land grants, as "encouragement" to expansion and the opening up of new territory.

A parallel process produced "Big Business" growth in other fields. John D. Rockefeller is credited with inventing the "trust" in 1882, and from then on huge industrial combines, with merging and affiliation of hitherto independent corporations, with interlocking directorates and such-like means, introduced monopoly conditions in other fields of economy. By 1904, the total capitalization of trusts in the United States, including railroad combines and industrial trusts, was more than twenty billions.* The Sherman Anti-Trust Act, which was passed in 1890, was a superficial concession to popular alarm at the growth of monopoly; but it is clear that the process—a process at once of expansion and of amalgamation—which was leading toward the domination of finance-capital of the twentieth century, was absolutely unchecked by it.

This amazing growth was accompanied by the corruption of public officials, which enabled both public utilities and industrial establishments to fleece the government and the consumers outrageously.

It was accompanied also by the development of manifold techniques of class oppression and repression. The press, the law, the courts, and the state's armed forces combined to make these new techniques effective: "Pinkertons," private armies of guards and strike-breakers, spies and provocateurs, the blacklist, the lockout, the assessing of fines upon workers, the company store system, the "iron-clad oath." ** The Haymarket struggle in Chicago was, on the side of capital, the embodiment of these anti-labor techniques. The Haymarket heroes challenged this terrific array of weapons on the part of the master class, and, despite the revenge upon them per-

---

* John Moody, *The Truth About the Trusts.*

** "The oath ('iron-clad oath') affirmed that the signer was not a member of a labor organization, did not contemplate joining and would never join one." (*The History of the Haymarket Affair,* by Henry David, p. 22.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonally taken by the master class, they won.

The eight-hour struggle of 1886 came just after the beginning of the formation of trusts, and at the time when the "Western frontier" could no longer offer to masses of the people an escape from industrial oppression. In other words, the avenues of escape from the working class was thenceforth very much restricted, and the path of direct battle with the exploiters of labor had to be followed. Capitalism was soon to enter a new stage; the working class, after this first nationwide round against developing industrial capitalism, was in the ensuing years to face the steadily sharpening struggle against developing monopoly capitalism.

Haymarket: First Stage in the Maturing of the American Proletariat

The May Day strike of 1886 and the unions and leaders involved in it were the culmination for that time of a long and growing line of strike struggles, union organizing, and efforts towards independent working-class political action.

The end of the Revolutionary War and the peace treaty which followed it came in 1781-83; in 1791 —barely a decade later—came the first recorded strike in America, a carpenters' strike for a twelve-hour day. From then on, class struggles became more frequent, larger, more militant. The constant succession of panics and crises, from the first big one in 1819 to the prolonged crisis in 1883-86, emphasized the greater and greater need for workers to unite and struggle for their own interests.

The great strikes in American history came after the Civil War, and the greatest of them, such as the Homestead Strike of 1892 against the Carnegie Steel Corporation, and the Pullman Strike of 1894, down to the steel strike of 1919, the strike of 500,000 miners and the Seattle General Strike in the same year, the Pacific Marine Workers' Strike and the resultant San Francisco General Strike of 1934, all came *after* the historic 1886 General Strike for the eight-hour day. That year was not only a culmination of the development of the preceding years; it was the inauguration of a new series of struggles on a higher plane.

The eight-hour-day struggle has an important and honorable place in the annals of American labor. The May, 1886, gains were to a large extent nullified during the reactionary terror let loose, not only in Chicago, but to a considerable extent throughout the country in succeeding months, but they were again won in the early 'nineties. The 1886 fight had brought forth lasting results.

The American workers won more than an economic victory in gaining the eight-hour day. The extra time gained for rest and thought was time gained for thought *about their relations* to the class which ruled and exploited them, for thought *about new gains* to be fought for. At first, as Marx explains, workers fought for shorter hours (for twelve hours, then for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten) because without shorter hours they could not live; they fought again, for still shorter hours, because, though they might live, life was not worth living. The winning of the eight-hour day may be taken to symbolize the gradual passage from illiterate brute existence to an existence in which the workers could contemplate their lot and resolve for a better one. It meant a chance for study, for acquisition of theory, a chance for organization on a higher political level. It meant the slow accumulation of mental preparation for the eventual leap from the kingdom of necessity into the realm of freedom. The higher political advancement made possible by the eight-hour-day victory emphasizes still more our debt to the Haymarket martyrs.

Looking back over the intervening half-century, the American workers can treasure the memory of the Haymarket struggle and the eight-hour-day strikes as a manifestation of working-class internationalism. The reactionary attacks made then upon the working-class leaders as "foreigners" failed to divide the workers sufficiently to prevent or break the strike. Indeed, the very fact that the Federation leaders asked the newly-formed Socialist International for support is a striking testimonial to the feeling of international solidarity among American workers at that time, and makes internationalism a tradition of American labor. In this light we can recognize the "foreign agent" cry today as again an attack on labor, an attack on the spirit of international brotherhood that has grown up out of the very soil of American history.

Among the techniques of repression and enslavement developed by the American capitalist class is the method of "frame-up," used in Chicago in 1886 to railroad Spies and Parsons and their fellows to prison and to the gallows, a method applied later in the cases of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, and applied likewise to Tom Mooney and to Sacco and Vanzetti. Today, with Wall Street driving to involve America in the war, the technique of frame-up, refined with the most cyncal use of the most trivial legal technicalities, is being directed once more against labor, particularly against the Communist Party, the vanguard of labor.

But labor is fighting back, as it fought back in 1886. Today, American capitalism, in its monopolist stage, its stage of decay, is more repressive than it was half a century ago; the bourgeoisie is more absolute in its control of the state, even while its economic order is in the process of decay and decline. But stronger, also, and more militant, is the American working class. It is more solidly organized on the trade union field today, and it has as political leader the Communist Party. The working class of America is growing more and more aware of the bankruptcy of capitalism, particularly in the light of the socialist achievements of the Soviet Union. It is moving increasingly toward independent political action.

As Roosevelt, in the interests of monopoly capital, develops his war-and-hunger program, the workers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand jobs and peace. As the Dies Committee, with Roosevelt's "sordid" blessing, tramples the civil liberties of progressives and Communists, as the Department of Justice tries to destroy trade unions through the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, labor and its allies fight back, insisting firmly on their civil rights. As the Roosevelt Administration speeds Wall Street's drive toward war, the "Yanks" thunder that they "are not coming." In response to the war-and-hunger program of monopoly capital, the progressive forces move toward the mobilization of labor, youth, the Negroes and the farmers, for a party of peace and progress.

In the war jingoism that is now being developed, Roosevelt's un-American committees scream that the Communists are "foreign agents." They seek thus to cut the international ties of the American working class, to smash the fraternal spirit of solidarity that exists between the workers of the United States and those of other lands, precisely for the purpose of driving the American workers to war in the interests of gold-thirsty American monopoly.

For the same war-making reason, the Wall Street parties—the Hoover-Dewey Republican Party and the Roosevelt-Dies Democratic Party—who are attacking American labor, are also attacking the country of socialist labor, the Soviet Union. American imperialism is making an assault on the American working class, the main force for peace in the United States; and it plots an assault on the workers' country, main bulwark of the peace and anti-imperialist forces in the world today.

But the Soviet Union, by its resolute, independent policy of peace, gives hope and confidence to American labor and its allies, gives them fortitude in the struggle against imperialist war, the struggle against capitalism, the source of war.

Today, the Communist Party is in the forefront of struggle for the civil rights of workers and the popular masses, for the rights of trade unions to strike and picket and bargain collectively, for the rights of foreign-born workers to the people's democratic attainments, for the rights of the Negro people to citizenship, to the ballot, to life itself—to full equality, social, economic and political.

The Communist Party heads the struggle of the American people against war and reaction. It is the heir of the militant traditions of American labor. The Communist Party, leading the fight today for the well-being of all exploited people without exception, points the way toward a socialist tomorrow.

The Haymarket heroes belong to the American working class. They were of the vanguard of their time, and they fought with utmost courage in defense of the contemporary and of the future needs of American workers—for the eight-hour day, and for socialism. They helped powerfully to advance the American working class, and they prepared the way for the rise of a more developed vanguard, thoroughly in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tegrated with the entire working class—the Communist Party of today.

As American workers march on this May Day, 1940, through the streets of hundreds of American cities, they can thrill with pride, not only at the prospect of coming victories, but also at the memory of the many heroes of labor who have preceded them, most of all, the hero-martyrs of May Day, 1886.

"Let the voice of the people be heard!"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REACTIONARY POLITICAL ROLE OF THE VATICAN

BY LOUIS F. BUDENZ

THE appointment of Myron C. Taylor as "personal envoy" of the President of the United States to the Pope makes pertinent an inquiry into the Vatican's political position in world affairs. Such an inquiry will throw new light on the present policies of the Papacy in the international scene and will explain their inherent opposition to the democratic struggles of the people for peace and security.

Taylor's appointment has brought forth expressions of condemnation and alarm from prominent Protestant churchmen in America. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ has stated its opposition to the appointment, lest it prove to be "a stepping stone to official diplomatic relations with the Vatican." Reverend Dr. George A. Buttrick, president of the Council and pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York, has gone further and told the President that American Protestants sense "a threat to their convictions" and entertain serious misgivings about the Taylor mission. A Baptist delegation has warned that this unusual procedure is a violation of the American principle of separation of Church and State, while the Evangelical Churches of Pennsylvania (meeting in New York in March) castigated the move as a trampling upon the Bill of Rights.

Even though some may attempt to detect a touch of sectarian bias in such statements, their validity is incontestable. It is based upon the American concept of the complete separation of Church and State—definitely made the law of the land by the Bill of Rights—which arose out of direct conflict with the Papal political stand on the matter and with those who sought to ape the Papal political pattern in this respect, such as the Established Church of England.

Church and State

Thomas Jefferson, the driving force behind the winning of the Bill of Rights, expressed "sovereign reverence" for that "act of the whole American people" which established the first Amendment to the Constitution, "thus building a wall of separation between Church and State." This complete separation of Church and State was the culmination of a centuries-old struggle in Europe for deep-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

going social and political reforms. Through this struggle the burgher class sought to throw off that joint domination of ecclesiastics who were also feudal lords and feudal lords who were frequently wielders of ecclesiastical power which constituted a mainstay of the feudal system.

A brief sketch of this titanic struggle and its repercussions in colonial America is found in Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought*. Parrington has given to Roger Williams his rightful place as the banner-bearer of religious liberty in the colonies, and has pointed out how Luther's slogan of "every man his own priest" (which dominated Williams' views) gave impetus to that burgher concept of a "democratic state." In colonial America Williams' movement for freedom of worship and a "democratic church" joined hands with Nathaniel Bacon's rebellion of the small farmers of Virginia (1676) to lay the foundations for the Jeffersonian party, which triumphed in part through the Bill of Rights.

Jefferson, who said much of the age-long conflict to demolish the feudal system, wrote in his "Notes on Religion":

"It was the misfortune of mankind that during the darker centuries the Christian priests, following their ambition and avarice, combining with the magistrate to divide the spoils of the people, could establish the notion that schismatics might be ousted of their possessions and destroyed. This notion we have not yet cleared ourselves from." (*The Jeffersonian Cyclopedia*, p. 745.)

We must then remember that, when Jefferson inveighs against "the civil magistrate" having anything to do with the control of religion, "its exercises, its discipline or its doctrines"—as he does in his letter to Reverend Samuel Miller and on other occasions—he is directly attacking the concept which led to that history of horrors represented by the Holy Inquisition. Under this concept of the Inquisition, which derived directly from the Vatican's political viewpoint, the Church was an arm of the State and the State was an arm of the Church, with the Church dominant. It is this idea which is now gathering its modern harvest in Franco fascism in Spain. Against that concept, and all its derivatives, the Bill of Rights was passed.

The Taylor appointment flies in the face of this basic American tradition and this fundamental American law. When we view the present national and international scene, the move has an even deeper significance. The second imperialist war has broken over a large part of the world, and the Pope and Roosevelt alike are intent upon spreading that war, and turning it into a "holy crusade" against the Soviet Union. In May, 1932, it will be recalled, Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical, *Caritate Christi*, openly calling for a united front of all imperialist states to overthrow the "phalanx of atheistic communists," "the enemies of social order" by "all legitimate human means." In that encyclical the Pope made a specific addition to include Japanese imperialism in the unity of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Christian" nations against the Soviet Union. A multi-imperialist anti-Soviet front has become likewise the conscious program of American finance capital, as voiced more and more strongly by the White House, as instanced by the "peace" mission of Sumner Welles —into which pattern the appointment of Myron C. Taylor to the Vatican fits most aptly. Thus have kindred imperialistic aims made bedfellows of the Pope and the President of the United States.

President Roosevelt resorts to this step after he has embarked on his war-and-hunger program and a campaign against American civil liberties reminiscent of the Alien and Sedition Laws and the worst days of A. Mitchell Palmer.

The President makes such a move at the moment when he is seeking to whip up that "holy war" against the Soviet Union upon which the *United States News* and other Big Business papers have commented so generously, at the time when, in accordance with this war policy, he is scuttling the public health bill, cutting down on relief and leveling heavy blows at the rights of labor through the Department of Justice.

The ambassador whom he has sent to advance such a hunger-and-war program has gone to a court, thus characterized by 80 leading American churchmen on April 1 in a statement of protest to the President: "Recent events in Spain and Abyssinia would not seem to indicate any partiality toward democracy on the part of the Vatican."

That ambassador has gone to the Vatican, which, in the first encyclical of Pius XII, issued on October 27, 1939, declared:

"But there is yet another error no less pernicious to the well being of the nations and to the prosperity of that great human society which gathers together and embraces within its confines all races. It is the error contained in those ideas which do not hesitate to divorce civil authority from every kind of dependence upon the Supreme Being—first cause and absolute master of man and of society—and from every restraint of a higher law derived from God as from its first source." (The *New York Times*, October 28, 1939.)

Since the fundamental concept of the Vatican makes the Pope the representative of the Supreme Being on earth, this statement reaffirms the dependence of "civil authority" on the appointed representatives of Rome.

It was this statement which caused Comrade Browder in his November 13 address at Madison Square Garden, to declare:

"We will always extend the hand of fellowship to our Catholic brothers. All the more necessary is it to point out, however, that the First Papal Encyclical of Pius XII contains a direct attack upon a fundamental American principle, the separation of Church and State, which may have a seriously deleterious effect upon American public life if it is followed up with practical efforts and proposals." (*Socialism, War, and America*, p. 13, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The very representative whom the White House chooses is symbolic of the hunger-war purposes of the mission. Myron Taylor is an outstanding executive in the House of Morgan's United States Steel Corporation, is a major agent of those "economic royalists" whom the President formerly condemned but with whom he now consorts. In the last World War, the United States Steel Corporation alone increased its assets one billion dollars out of the blood of America's youth on Flanders Field and in the Argonne. The House of Morgan is the head and front of those sinister Wall Street forces which hope to fatten American imperialism still further by crushing the rights of the people at home and by involving the United States in the imperialist war abroad.

When thus seen in the total picture, this gesture against separation of Church and State, therefore, by an interesting historical logic, accompanies the moves to smash labor's civil rights and the Administration's efforts to plunge America into the war. The political perspectives of the Vatican are in accord with these White House-Wall Street policies. Through the mouth of Pius XII, through *Osservatore Romano,* official Vatican organ, and through the Vatican radio, a campaign of incitement against the peace policy of the Soviet Union has been carried on. The Papal politicians are openly conniving with British and American imperialism to bring about that "war for Christianity" to which Mr. Chamberlain hypocritically referred, and which is belied by the crucifixion of Ireland and the torture of India. The Vatican has gone so far in its aid to British imperialism as to denounce the Irish Republican movement, through a series of pastoral letters by Joseph Cardinal MacRory, primate of Ireland. This, it may be said, is in line with an almost unbroken stand by the Vatican for the continued submission by the Irish people to British domination.

These developments are of deep concern to all the peace-desiring people of America, especially to the masses of the American Catholics. While the Vatican works with Mr. Roosevelt to turn the inter-imperialist war into a war against the Soviet Union, with America dragged into the conflict, the American masses, including the Catholics, want the United States to keep out of the war. Hundreds of thousands of these American Catholics, as members of unions affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsed the pronouncement of the United Mine Workers' Convention, stating: "We want no war or any part of it." They also joined in supporting opposition to war loans to Mannerheim. In the American Federation of Labor, also, thousands of Catholic workers have expressed their determination not to permit American entry into the war, a determination evidenced by A. F. of L. union participation in the April 6 Peace Day rallies.

Criticism and condemnation of the Papacy as a political force is a chief road to the defense of the rights of Catholics to worship as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they see fit. For a Communist, in discussing the subject, the matter is quite clear. The Communists stand in the front ranks of those who fight for the religious and civil rights of the Catholic masses.

In bourgeois-democratic countries, Catholic spokesmen aplenty have also testified to the fact that the Papal political program, in general and at any specific time, is not connected inherently with the religious faith of Catholics.

Conscious of the minority position of Catholics in the Protestant English-speaking world, the Catholic colony of Maryland in 1649 broke with the Papal Church-State concept by declaring religious freedom for all Trinitarian Christians —though it did not go so far as Roger Williams in asserting the right of Jews, Unitarians, and atheists to hold such tenets as they pleased.

Ludwig Windhorst, leader of the Catholic Center Party in Germany, likewise reminded the Pope that in political affairs he would follow his own course without Vatican dictation.

In the 1928 presidential campaign Alfred E. Smith also asserted that his faith as Catholic in no way bound him to the Vatican politically. His statement at that time was approved by certain authorities of the Church in this country and is seemingly supported by the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

One hundred years before, Bishop John England of Charleston, South Carolina, had stated:

"Let the Pope and Cardinals and all the powers of the Catholic world united make the least encroachment on that constitution, we will protect it with our lives. Summon a General Council—let that council interfere in the mode of our electing but an assistant to a turnkey of a prison—we deny its right; we reject its usurpation."

Despite the constant efforts of the hierarchy to use the religious faith of Catholics as a spring-board to support the political attempts of the Vatican at revival of the Church-State union, these statements of Catholics themselves indicate that the religious belief of the Catholic is in no way bound up with political allegiance to the Papacy. As a matter of historical fact, it is precisely the rejection of the Vatican's political views which has safeguarded the religious rights of Catholics in this country. Thomas Jefferson, the determined opponent of Papal political tenets, was by that very fact the foremost early champion of religious and civil rights for Catholics in America.

Church-State Union in Practice

The Vatican's present pro-war and anti-people's position, directly antagonistic to the interests of the American masses, including the Catholics, stems from the whole history of the Papacy as an economic and political power. That history, at least from the Middle Ages on, records the Vatican's political influence as always exercised in favor of the most reactionary social forces involved in any particular crisis. Why has this been the case? Historically, the concept of the temporal power of the Vati-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can is based materially upon the far-flung properties in land and other forms of wealth which the Church gathered unto itself, through its exactions upon the "lower orders," its rich benefices, and the wealth that was accumulated by the temporal manipulation of its ecclesiastical favors. A monopoly of property was to be built up and maintained through a monopoly of religion dominating a monopoly of state power.*

Thus, the very essence of the Vatican's "reason for being" as a political power is predicated upon the theory of the Church-State and the State-Church. To sustain this two-fold idea, without which it would no longer be allowed elbow-room in the political field, the Papacy can find allies in any specific period only in that class forced to meet the threat of progress by oppressing and retarding the progressive forces in society.

The idea of the Church-State was expressed in the claim to "temporal power," which led to the establishment of the Papal States in Central Italy in the Middle Ages when the Papacy was at the height of its political strength. The State-Church lingered on in such backward countries as Austria and Spain until the very recent past and has again been brought back to life in the latter country by the bloody regime of Franco.

For the workings of this system in the late Middle Ages, when it was in full bloom, we can go through the pages of the Catholic historian, Ludwig von Pastor. His twenty-nine-volume *History of the Popes Since the Middle Ages* is of particular significance, since these tomes are the product of the final opening up of the Vatican archives to Pastor by Pope Leo XIII. That Pastor was himself a champion of the Church-State and State-Church idea is vividly exemplified by the dedication of his work to Francis Ferdinand, the Habsburg Archduke who represented the political degradation of the Austrian people.

Let us take from his pages the case of Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia), the Pope most attacked by the Protestant Reformers for "the unrestrained sensuality" which the Catholic historian admits. It is this Pope who, by a Papal Bull in 1493, "conferred" upon Ferdinand and Isabella the New World. The theory upon which the Papacy could thus dispose of parts of the world was that society, the "divine State," dominated by the Church, is invested with temporal as well as spiritual powers.

The strange union of Church and State, which was then at its zenith and rotten ripe with decay, is seen in the fact that Alexander's illegitimate son, Cesare Borgia, resigned his position as Cardinal and Archbishop of Valencia, to which his father had appointed him, in order to become Duke of Valentinois. Thus, Pope Alexander was able to build up his son as "Cesare Borgia of France, by the Grace of God Duke of Romagna and of Valencia and Urbino, Prince of Andria, Lord

* This inter-relation of ecclesiastical property, state power, and religious monopoly under the feudal system is most clearly analyzed in Frederick Engels' *The Peasant War in Germany*, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Piombino, Standard-bearer and General-in-Chief of the Church."

In like manner did Alexander use a Papal Bull to bring about the division of the Kingdom of Naples between France and Spain, utilizing ecclesiastical edicts for political ends. This state of affairs was quite usual in the period of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Invading armies, covetous of territory or seizing the rich ecclesiastical benefices, were preceded by an "artillery barrage" of Papal Bulls, threats of excommunication and interdicts. Political in content and beneficial to the entrenched classes in effect, these pronunciamentos were cloaked in religious garb. The whole business was personified by Alexander's immediate successor but one, Julius II (1503-13), who went into the field at the head of his armies, booted and spurred. It is worth noting the almost naive manner in which Pastor, as an apologist for the Vatican, defends this military Pope:

"It is, however, objected, that the Vicar of Christ should not be a warrior. This objection completely ignores the two-fold nature of the position created for the Papacy by its historical development. Ever since the eighth century the Popes, besides being Vicars of Christ, had also been temporal princes. As such they were compelled, when necessary, to defend their rights against attacks, and to make use of arms for the purpose." (Vol. VI, p. 450.)

Here, in a nutshell, is the foundation for the Vatican's political activities, a viewpoint which still haunts the Papacy in 1940, with Vatican City as the center of its "temporal power." The Vatican regarded political differences with it as heresy. The way was paved for the "heresies" of the Reformation to become the expression of political and social revolt against rotting feudalism.

The Vatican Against Progress

The "argument" in behalf of the temporal power of the Popes is one that would cut the ground from under the plea of American Catholics for the right to worship as they see fit. The concept of temporal power for the head of the Roman Catholic Church involves a union of church and state which in turn was to arm the anti-Papal temporal rulers of such rising national states as England under Henry VIII and Elizabeth with the claim that they could set up exclusive state churches of their own. Thus the way was opened up for sending countless Catholics to the executioner's block and to institute an era of proscription of civil rights for Catholics. The resulting persecution of Catholics was almost equal in brutality and extent to that which the political arm of the Church, allied with the ecclesiastical arm of the feudal state, had unloosed against "heretics" in the later Middle Ages. The liberties accorded Catholics in America are based fundamentally on a complete negation of the temporal power of the Papacy or any State Church and the abuses that go with it.

Mankind has gained tremendously from the ending of the union of Church and State wherever this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

step has been taken. In every far-going forward movement of the masses, particularly in the working class movements, an essential feature of all reform was the abolition of ecclesiastical state machinery.

Thus, in regard to Latin America, a liberal bourgeois historian writes:

"Another great obstacle to the development of a Latin American democracy was the opposition of the Roman Catholic church. In Latin America the church combined with the landed interests to oppose republican government and public education. At the very beginning of their independence all the states made the Roman Church the State Church. While the Inquisition was eliminated a few years afterward, its spirit remained alive in the republics. As soon as the liberals began to put into effect their ideas on popular education, suffrage, social and economic equality, liberty of conscience and of the press, they were challenged by the church authorities." (Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, *Latin America—Its Place in World Life*, p. 113, Willett, Clark and Co., New York, 1937.)

Such opposition between the Church-State political aims of the Vatican and the rising Spanish-American democracies was dramatized particularly in the career of the liberator of Mexico, the Indian, Benito Juarez. The absence of any reference to this struggle in the otherwise splendid film, *Juarez*, is undoubtedly due to the pressure of the Hollywood censorship, which prevents full and frank discussion of such historical episodes where the Papacy is involved.

In Dr. Inman's pages we read:

"Juarez was the first Spanish-American ruler to point out the impossibility of conducting a democracy in the presence of a State Church that owned a large part of the real estate, conducted a considerable part of the banking, and controlled the thinking of most of the inhabitants of the country. In the midst of the leader's struggles with the clericals he was suddenly confronted with the foreigners. But he was able to triumph even over the combined intervention of Napoleon (III) and the Pope, expressed in the person of Emperor Maximilian, whom the little Indian captured and shot in 1867." (*Ibid.*, p. 148.)

The Great French Revolution put an end to the tyranny, not only of the First Estate, the nobility gathered around the kingship, but also of the Second Estate, the ecclesiastics allied with the feudal nobility against the "lower orders." The ending of the backward feudal system, and the opening of the high road for the new higher social order could not have come about save by the separation of Church and State.

This was strongly confirmed by the anti-clerical character of the Enlightenment period in France and elsewhere. Any attempt, therefore, to annul or weaken the separation of Church and State means turning the clock of history backward.

How clearly this is evidenced today in Spain, where the Vatican and Franco work hand in glove. There the misery and degradation of the Spanish people, in consequence of the defeat of the People's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Front, is symbolized by the unholy wedding of the Church and State. The seizure of the land for the rotten Bourbon nobles is accompanied by the re-investment of the Church with riches, lands and the power of exploitation over the Spanish peasant.

The Spanish Bishops, in their pastoral letter of 1937 supporting Franco, put forward the medieval declaration that Catholics are vested with an obligation to conduct armed rebellion against a Republican form of government, since it brings about the severing of the Church-State union. This letter went so far as to condemn "the irresponsible autocracy of a parliament." It denounced in principle, not only the People's Front Government, but also the democratic institutions, the freedom of worship and separation of Church and State established by the Spanish Republican Constitution of 1931. The letter drew this biting comment from 150 leading Protestant churchmen in America: "It is hard to believe that this pastoral letter was written in the twentieth century." (The *New York Times*, October 3, 1937.)

One of the great achievements of the Bolshevik Revolution, now permanently embodied in the Stalinist Constitution of the Soviet Union, is the complete separation of Church and State. The fostered ignorance, superstition and degradation of the masses which accompanied the union of the Orthodox Church and the tsarist state had become modern classic examples of the fruits of such an infamous set-up. The separation of Church and State in the Soviet Union has been an inevitable accompaniment of the socialist Revolution, with the quickening growth of literacy, culture, and general welfare among the masses.

The battle which the Papacy put up in the sixteenth century for the retention of feudalism continued to shape Vatican political policy down to the present day. We have seen it asserting itself in the Great French Revolution. We behold it in the ensuing history of France, where the Vatican looked to a restored monarchy at each turn to resurrect its medieval privileges. It was only with the help of monarchical French arms that the "temporal power" of the Papacy crushed the Roman Republic in 1849 and for twenty-one years kept the people of the Papal states in bondage. Not until 1870, with the collapse of Napoleon III, was the last French garrison withdrawn from the Eternal City. The people of the Papal states, left to themselves, promptly voted to be annexed to United Italy.

In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Karl Marx has shown how the expedition to save the Papal "temporal power" was accompanied by the crushing of the peasants and workers within France. Under this "idée napoleonienne," as Marx expressed it, "the Priest then appears as only the anointed bloodhound of the earthly police."

Down to the first decade of the twentieth century the battle continued inside France for special

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

privileges for the Papacy, the properties of the ecclesiastics, and their special school system.

We see the Vatican's reactionary influence continuing in the long retention of the darkest feudalistic survivals in Austria and Spain, accompanied by Church-State union. We see its fruits in the clerical fascism of those Austrian "Christian Socialists," whose social demagogy Hitler was to study so carefully, as revealed in *Mein Kampf*, in order to lay the foundations for Nazism in Germany. We see this Vatican policy in our own day in the collusion of the Vatican with Franco fascism and in the Papal blessings of Mussolini's armies in their rape of Ethiopia.

When capitalism had won its place and become supreme, the Vatican allied itself politically with the dominant capitalists against the workers and farmers. With the imperialist stage of capitalism, a similar alliance was formed with the imperialists and eventually with the most reactionary or the most aggressive of those war-makers and exploiters.

The Papacy and Ireland

This is seen most strikingly in the struggle for the independence of Ireland, where the weight of Papal influence has been thrown time and time again in favor of the British landlord-banker combination, through the voice and activities of the "Castle Bishops." There, in order to aid the capitalists, the Vatican has suceeded in pushing the Irish masses into a landless peasantry, as near to feudal conditions as could be established next door to British capitalism.

The initial invasion of Ireland in 1169 by the English king, Henry II, took place under the authority of a Bull issued earlier by an English-born Pope, Adrian IV.* The pretext was that the English crown should spread Christianity among the sons of St. Patrick! Eight years later, the Dublin Synod of the Catholic Church set forth Henry's right to sovereignity in Ireland and threatened excommunication to those who would oppose it. That synod also abolished the right of sanctuary—a well-established rule of the Church law for the protection of criminals and political refugees in church buildings—in order to aid the British conquest.

When, in 1319, the Irish joined with the Scots against the English, Pope John XXII ordered the excommunication of all Irish fighting the British crown.

Around the Battle of the Boyne —fought on July 1, 1690—much of Ireland's traditions and internal divisions arise. It is an ironical fact, nonetheless, that the cause of William of Orange, supposedly the anti-Catholic cause, was financed in part by the Pope of that time, Innocent XI. When the news of the defeat of the Irish at the Boyne

* There has been considerable dispute as to the authenticity of this Bull granted by Adrian IV (Nicholas Brakespeare, 1154-59). But most historians regard it as authentic, and it is in the entire spirit of the acts of the Papacy in support of the British conquest of Ireland. The history of Papal-Irish relations is well epitomized in the eloquent pamphlet, *Labor, Nationality and Religion* by James Connolly. It is also covered in part in Leopold von Ranke's monumental *History of the Popes*, the first English translation of which was published in 1847, and in such volumes as *The History of Ireland*, by Stephen Gwyn, New York, 1923.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reached Rome, the succeeding Pope, Alexander VIII, ordered a "Te Deum" for the Vatican-Orange victory.

In the succeeding years—in the Revolution of 1798, in Robert Emmett's attempt at freeing Ireland a few years later, in the peasants' move to refuse payment of rents as an answer to the Great Famine, in the rise of the Fenian Brotherhood—the Irish hierarchy denounced the efforts at freedom.

The Irish Land League, which gave a mighty blow to Irish landlordism, was denounced by Archbishop McCabe in September, 1879, and several times thereafter. In the midst of the fight of the Irish Catholic peasants against the brutalities of landlordism, the Vatican on May 11, 1883, issued a Rescript condemning disaffection to the English government.

The entire course of collusion between the Vatican as an international political power and the British crown is dramatized in the case of Robert Emmett. As James Connolly, the great Marxist and commander of the Easter Rising, says:

"Every year the members of the Irish race scattered throughout the earth celebrate the memory of Robert Emmett, and cherish him in their hearts as the highest ideal of patriot and martyr; but on the occasion of his martyrdom the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, representative of the British Government in Ireland, denouncing Emmett in the strongest possible terms." (James Connolly, Foreword to *Labor, Nationality and Religion,* Dublin, 1935.)

It is little wonder, then, that we see the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland in 1940 again opposing efforts at Irish independence and unity.

The condemnation by the Irish hierarchy of revolutionary movements for the emancipation of Ireland has frequently expressed itself in denunciation of the "methods" employed by the revolutionary forces. It is significant, however, as Stephen Gwyn points out in his *History of Ireland,* that the hierarchy remained silent about the methods of violence when employed for their benefit, against the Anglican Established Church, but revived their condemnations as soon as the victory over the Established Church had been won.

The Popes and the Socialist Movement

In the course of the gigantic struggles since the Middle Ages for the advance of capitalism and then of socialism, the Catholic masses have been drawn by the millions into the battle on the side of progress. The Vatican has been compelled to reckon with these progressive tendencies within the ranks of its spiritual followers. It has done so, in practically each instance, in order to curb and combat the rising movement and thus safeguard as far as possible Rome's continued efforts for State-Church union and the rule of reactionary classes.

It was only one hundred years after the Great French Revolution that the Papacy publicly renounced its steady policy to incite a return of the monarchy in France. This turn was made through the cele-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brated "Letter to the Archbishops, the Bishops, the Clergy and all the Catholics of France" of Pope Leo XIII in 1892.

But this armistice was signed with bourgeois democracy because a new progressive "specter" had appeared on the international horizon and had proved that it was a factor to be reckoned with—the international workingmen's movement under the guidance of Marxism.

Fourteen years before—in 1878—the newly-crowned Pope had sought to smash the rising revolutionary workers' movement by a flat denunciation of its "errors." The encyclical *Quod Apostoloci Muneris* (issued December 28, 1878) had denounced "Socialists, Communists and Nihilists" as agitators seeking to destroy the social order. But by the beginning of the 'nineties the Socialist movement had become a far-reaching force in many European countries. The efforts of the workers to organize in unions and to seek independent political expression had begun to ring through the world. In 1886 the great eight-hour day movement began in the United States, and 1890 was to witness the spread of this movement into the celebration of International May Day. In Catholic countries, such as Austria and Belgium, the working people turned out by the thousands under the red flag of the international working class.

It was in this atmosphere and against this background that Leo XIII (1878-1903) issued his famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, on the "Condition of the Working Classes" (May 15, 1891). This utterance has been much used in the United States to give the impression that the Vatican has favored the formation of trade unions, and contains the oft-quoted words, "A small number of rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

Examination of the encyclical will show, however, that its championship of "workingmen's associations" is greatly tempered by its complacency toward "mixed unions of working men and employers," a device which would split the workers' movement and lead them into class-collaboration betrayals of their interests. Moreover, the encyclical makes a direct thrust at the unity of the working people, in trade unions and political movements, through its emphasis on the urgency of "Christian unions." Wherever the hierarchy feels strong enough to arrange the setting up of such organizations, it has done so at the expense of that solidarity which is the chief weapon of the working people. When examined carefully, this argument for "Christian unions" works toward that domination of civil life by the Vatican political apparatus which brings about union of Church and State and leads to the clerical fascism of the Austrian "Christian Socialists" and of Franco.

The purpose of the encyclical is revealed in its condemnation of socialism and communism, which Leo XIII declared were "so clearly futile for all practical purposes."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Less than half a century later, the Soviet Union had so overwhelmingly demonstrated the "practicability" of socialism, in its triumph on one-sixth of the globe, that Pius XI (1922-39) was compelled to switch his condemnation to "Atheistic Communism," in the encyclical popularly known by that name, thus laying the basis for that "holy war" of the imperialists against the Soviet Union for which Wall Street and the White House long so intensely.

Leo XIII goes on to condemn communism as "emphatically unjust" and as a view which "must be utterly rejected" because it denies "the natural right" of private property. Thus, while stating that "it is shameful and inhuman to treat men as chattels to make money by," the Pope stops the workers in so far as he can from smashing the system under which this "shameful and inhuman treatment" is continued. He defends with the bourgeois doctrine of the "natural right" of private property the huge properties of the Morgans, Rockefellers and other finance capitalists and "forbids" the workers from taking the only step which would free them of the incubus of monopoly and exploitation.

This union of the Papacy with the finance capitalists was dramatized in 1913 when Pius X (1903-14) referred publicly to the elder J. P. Morgan as "a great and good man" on the death of that corrupt despoiler of the homes of millions of the American people. (*Cf.* Gustavus Myers, *History of Great American Fortunes,* p. 634, Modern Library, New York, 1936.)

Pius X further emphasized the determination of the Papacy to prevent the working people from achieving the triumph of their cause through socialism by his condemnation of *Le Sillon* (*The Furrow*) in 1910. This movement of young French Catholic intellectuals was a vague attempt to link Catholics to some sort of a socialist tendency. *Le Sillon* contended that it was essential to rid mankind of three forms of oppression—political, economic and intellecual.

For that purpose it proposed three "emancipations," as follows:

"First, political emancipation: the people are today in subjection to an authority distinct from themselves, and they must be freed. Second, economic emancipation: the people are today dependent upon employers who possess the instruments of their work, and who exploit, oppress and debase them; the yoke must be shaken off. Third, intellectual emancipation: the people are dominated by a caste called the ruling class, whose intellectual development enables it to exercise undue influence; this bondage too must be broken. This triple emancipation is also a leveling process, and will establish equality as well as liberty." (Parker Thomas Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France,* pp. 375-82, New York, 1921.)

A chief point in the condemnation of this organization by Pius X was its doctrine of popular sovereignity, held by the Pope to be "fallacious." *Le Sillon* made "the people the source of all govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental authority." Pius declared that Catholic doctrine regarded "God as the source of all power." When it is recalled that God, under this view, is expressed through the Vatican (the Pope being "the Vicar of Christ on earth"), it is apparent that this Papal statement continues the emphasis on the union of Church and State, under the dominance of the Church, to which the Vatican returns at every stage of history.

This condemnation was a repetition in part of the *Syllabus of Errors*, issued by Pius IX (1846-78) under which he condemned separation of Church and State and other fundamentals of the American Republic and other modern bourgeois democracies. This *Syllabus*, in fact, is such a violent and brazen throwback to the Middle Ages that many American spokesmen of the hierarchy have endeavored to obscure its meaning and to play down its significance. But the Papacy itself, through Leo XIII and other voices, has acknowledged this pronouncement of December 8, 1864, to be a basic concept of the Vatican.

In this document Pius claimed for the Church control of all culture and science and of the entire educational system. He rejected liberty of faith, conscience, and worship for other creeds. He claimed the complete independence of the Church from State control. reaffirmed the temporal power of the Popes, and finally made this amazing declaration: "The Pope neither can nor ought to be reconciled with progress, liberalism and modern civilization." (*Syllabus comprectens praecipuos nostrae aetatis errores*, issued by Pius IX, together with the encyclical *Quanta cura*, in 1864.)

This was merely a re-assertion, against the rising bourgeois liberal movements of that time, of the feudalistic basis of the Vatican's view of the modern world.

It is not surprising that, when the growth of the Soviet Union brings hope and assurance to the workers of the world that they can abolish the decaying capitalist system, the Vatican now seeks to marshal all imperialist forces into a war against the socialist republics. Just as it sought to war on rising capitalism for the preservation of dying feudalism, so does it now ally itself with the most reactionary elements to war on socialism for the preservation of decaying capitalism.

The Vatican's nauseous apologia for the attempts of the "honest" rich is designed to subject the workers to the exploitation represented by these very rich. The counsel that there will always be rich and poor—clearly exploded today by the existence of the Soviet Union—is designed to spread defeatism among the workers as to the possibilities of throwing off the oppression of the monopolists.

It is quite in accord with its entire history of opposition to the emancipation of the working classes that the Vatican can be found today, at every turn of events, aiding and abetting the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union.

From its very birth the interna-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional working class movement for socialism found itself opposed by the reactionary forces rallied by the Vatican. In every country, the press and pulpit dominated by the Papacy carried on a bitter campaign against the hopes and aspirations of the workers—expressed through the socialist movement—for an end of monopoly and its attendant evils of unemployment and war.

The Vatican gave the impetus to the assault on the socialist movement through its open and sweeping denuncations of such movements, from the encyclicals of Leo XIII to those of Pius XII. In addition, the Papacy has persistently sought to cultivate among the workers a spirit of submission to capitalism, as earlier it cultivated among the masses submission to feudalistic abuses. This is best seen in the constant theme song of the encyclicals that "there were always rich and poor and always will be."

This is illustrated afresh in the encyclical of Pius XII, issued on November 11, 1939, to the American hierarchy. In this utterance, the Pope says:

"The history of the ages teaches that there were always rich and poor; that it will always be so we may gather from the unchanging tenor of human destinies. Worthy of honor are the poor, who fear God because theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven and because they readily abound in spiritual graces. But the rich, if they are upright and honest, are God's dispensers and providers of this world's goods."

In the United States, where the very foundation stone of the Republic was secularization of civil life, the Vatican and its representatives moved more circumspectly than in the case of the "eldest daughter of the Church," as France was long called in Papal phraseology.

The example of the colony of Maryland which established religious liberty at least for all Christians who believed in the Trinity, regardless of sect, modified the viewpoint of the Catholic masses. The early Irish immigrants, because of their hatred of the British Empire, threw themselves wholeheartedly into the revolutionary struggle even though its chief spokesman, Jefferson, was a champion of secularization.

The Irish Bishops, it is true, tried to hurl the thunderbolts of anathema from across the Atlantic at all those who fought against the British crown in the American Revolution. But the Irish were in a new country now, and did not heed these interdictions.

Further than that, the Irish Catholics, who were the overwhelming majority in the early Catholic immigrations, placed themselves under the banner of the Jeffersonians. It was the political army of the "atheist" Jefferson which protected them against the Alien and Sedition Laws and other excesses of the "native Americans" against them.

In this unfavorable atmosphere to the union of Church and State, the hierarchy in the early stages moved with care. Even in the 'eighties, James Cardinal Gibbons

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took a comparatively progressive stand in "sanctioning" the Knights of Labor.

When the American Republic was torn by internal enemies, however, the Vatican could not forbear to attempt to strike a blow at this democracy. In the titanic battle between slavocracy and the United States under Lincoln, Pius IX was the first foreign potentate to "recognize" the treasonable Confederacy. It is something more than an accident that Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were calling upon the British working men to prevent British intervention on the side of the South, while the Papacy was giving the slavocracy aid and comfort at the behest of the most benighted and greedy forces in England.

It is also something more than an accident that the American Government, still under the guiding spirit of Lincoln, threw down the gauntlet to Napoleon III and the Pope in favor of Juarez and his struggle for democracy and the separation of Church and State in Mexico.

The American Hierarchy Against the Workers

As the vital capitalism of America entered into its imperialist stage, the Catholic hierarchy emerged as a more powerful force in the American scene. For this there were two major reasons: (1) The favorable opinion formed among Big Business circles of the hierarchy as a "conservatizing" influence, as was admitted by the late Cardinal Mundelein in his famous declaration of January, 1938.* (2) American wealth was making the Church richer in this country, and this enhanced the importance of the American branch, as Catholic influence in certain European countries declined.

Within the ranks of the clergy and even of the hierarchy itself, two contrary tendencies were produced by this. One was the "Americanism" movement, supported by no less a public figure than Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul. This tendency to dissociate the American Catholic Church from the international Vatican policies caused concern in Rome, was frowned upon by the Papacy and probably cost Archbishop Ireland the loss of the Cardinal's hat.

For a moment, this tendency seemed to threaten the Vatican with a movement similar to that which produced Gallicanism in France. However, the contrary development—to come forward more boldly with the State-Church union idea in one form or another and to dictate more and more to the civil authorities—gained supremacy in the hierarchy.

Thus, William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston took up the cudgels for the textile mill owners in his bitter opposition to the urgently needed Child Labor Amendment. He was more influential among the higher

* On January 2, 1938, in an address before the Archdiocese Union of the Holy Name Society in Chicago, Cardinal Mundelein stated: "The trouble with us in the past has been that we were too often allied or drawn up into an alliance with the wrong side. Selfish employers of labor have flattered the Church by calling it the great conservative force, and then called upon it to act as a police force while they paid but a pittance of a wage to those who worked for them. I hope that day has gone by."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clergy than such liberals among the Catholics as Dr. John A. Ryan. In New York State in particular, the representatives of the hierarchy went to bat for the Liberty League in defense of child slavery.

When the Spanish people were engaged in a life-and-death struggle, with the armies of the fascist Franco and the invaders, the Catholic hierarchy in America carried on such a pressing campaign in aid of the rotten Bourbon nobility and Juan March, the Spanish Morgan, as to be a disgrace to democracy. It paralleled the championship by the Vatican of the putrid, corrupt French monarchy and French episcopate at the time of the Great Revolution.

It is significant that every priest who came to these shores, to speak for the Spanish people (even from the Catholic Basques), was accused of being "unfrocked." At the same time, the Catholic hierarchy was not disposed to unfrock the anti-Semitic, fascist Father Coughlin, although a number of Catholic voices have been raised against him.

Coughlin has used a Catholic pulpit—the Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Michigan—for the purpose of inciting the most degraded, un-American, anti-Semitic attacks. The fruit of his fascist utterances has been manifested in the stabbing of members of the Jewish race in the streets of New York, and is now revealed dramatically in the trial of the Christian Fronters for preparing to dynamite the offices of the *Daily Worker* and the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and carry on terroristic acts against the Government. The fascist priest has organized efforts to smash the C.I.O. unions in the automobile industry. And yet, the hierarchy permits him to preach freely his fascist doctrines under cover of "religion."

Charges have also been brought to the attention of the Federal authorities by John L. Spivak of gross violation of Federal laws and outright racketeering by Coughlin. But the Federal authorities do not move a finger in the matter. It is pertinent to ask, in view of this peculiar immunity which the fascist priest enjoys: Is this part of the price paid in our domestic life for the Taylor mission?

Communist Solidarity With the Catholic Masses

What can we Communists do, in the midst of such a scene, to bring the Catholic masses closer to their non-Catholic fellow-workers in the war against poverty at home and in opposition to America's involvement in war abroad?

There is no doubt that a great tug-of-war is going on among American Catholics, as described by George Seldes in *The Catholic Crisis*. This inner struggle is even more deeply rooted than Seldes suggests.

The masses of American Catholics will be injured as deeply by the slaughter of their sons for the profits and power of American imperialism as any other group in America. M-Day will not only entail the regimentation and militarization of all labor, but it will open the road for that fascism which in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America would particularly attack the Catholic masses as the largest minority group. And yet, the Vatican and the Catholic hierarchy as a whole are committed to a policy designed to promote the Wall Street war-hunger program at home and to plunge America into a "holy war" across the seas.

We Communists can proceed to resolve this contradiction with the following moves, among others:

First, we can redouble our efforts to weld all American workers, whether Catholic, Protestant, Jewish or athiest, into a strong trade union movement. All union groups will profit by joint activities for their common cause. The influence of the trade unions on civil affairs is a secularizing one. The American labor movement has been a leading champion of the free public school system, despite the large portion of Catholic trade unionists.

In this connection, we should patiently explain to our Catholic fellow-workers, wherever the hierarchy attempts to interfere in trade union affairs, that the injecting of the issue of religion into the trade unions will hopelessly split the solidarity of the workers. It will be particularly harmful to the Catholics, who are a minority in America. The Big Business interests, which oppose the workers, do not allow religion to interefere with their unity against the working people. Morgan the Episcopalian, Ford the non-believer, and Raskob the Catholic, all join hands in exploitation of the mass of the people.

Secondly, we can intensify our activities towards welding all the common people, farmers, workers, and middle classes into a powerful anti-imperialist peace movement.

We can explain to our Catholic fellow-citizens how vital peace is to their welfare in this country. Imperialist war will unloose Ku Klux fascism upon America. Those representatives of the hierarchy who dream of clerical fascism, according to the pattern worked out by the Vatican in Spain, are bitterly deluding those who listen to them.

Clerical fascism in Austria, which destroyed the free trade unions with guns in the Vienna massacre, was itself crushed by the guns of Hitler fascism. Fascist tendencies will express themselves similarly in America, as we can judge from the revived Ku Klux Klan, in the persecution of the Catholic masses. Further, we can explain how the continued maneuverings of the Vatican for the Church-State union and for a "holy war" give an excuse to the Ku Klux Klan elements to call for persecution of the Catholic masses.

American thought is decidedly anti-Papal. It has not expressed itself vigorously on this matter because of the concept of "tolerance" which Jeffersonianism has stamped on American life. Overt acts on the part of the Vatican and its representatives will arouse this anti-Papal tendency. This might result in extreme antagonism to the civil rights of the Catholic masses.

Thirdly, we can expand the campaign for civil liberties and the Bill of Rights, specifically drawing in wider and wider groups and more individuals into the battle for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights of the Communists and trade unions. We can point out how wise were those few Catholic newspapers (as formerly the *New World* in Chicago) and those few Catholic leaders who opposed the Dies Committee and the Little Dies bills in the various states. By taking this stand, they were not only defending civil rights in general. They were definitely protecting the civil and religious liberties of the Catholic people. Thousands of Catholics are put in peril by the so-called anti-alien bills, even as the Irish immigrants were in Jefferson's time.

Fourthly, we can increase our cooperation with Catholic masses by stressing the question of a united, independent Ireland. By attention on this issue, hundreds of thousands of American Catholics can come more vividly to understand the present international scene. This issue has great political importance, since Ireland is still a key position of British imperialism. Undermining British imperialism in Ireland would be a huge contribution to the general undermining of imperialism throughout the world.

Fifthly, we can carry forward a wider and more graphic campaign of education on the value and urgency of socialism to the American people. We can show that in the present battles against monopoly and the warmongers, it will be possible to achieve decisive victory over the monopolists and war-makers only through attaining socialism in America. We can raise with our Catholic fellows the questions of bread, peace, and freedom, which are involved in the winning of socialism. We can also more vividly explain the Stalinist Constitution of the Soviet Union, its guarantees of employment, leisure, education and also of the right to worship.

We have at hand today that magnificent exhibit of triumphant socialism in the Soviet Union which the champions of socialism did not have thirty years ago.

Sixthly, we can on appropriate occasions get out special literature for our Catholic fellow-workers, discussing in a friendly way the questions of war and peace and of Church and State, and bringing these questions home to their own firesides. We can discuss these issues in terms of Son John and Daughter Mary, of whether Johnny is to get his gun again and be made a mangled stump of bleeding flesh in No Man's Land for the greater glory of Wall Street, of whether Mary is to have her life shattered by the terrors of war and the pangs of hunger for herself and her future children.

Finally, we can perfect our understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory, in order to be able to interpret more clearly the vital issues facing the masses, as well as the principles of scientific socialism on the question of the right to worship and on its opposition to any union of Church and State.

In this connection, we can devote ourselves to a close study of the Marxist-Leninist classics, and make use of such splendid contributions as Comrade Browder's *Communism and Religion.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are 20,000,000 Catholics in America, the vast majority of whom can be won to a program of bread, peace, freedom and eventually to a championship of socialism.

One of the chief measures for the salvation of the Catholic masses from war and hunger is the recall of the representative of the real "Murder, Inc.," the United States Steel Corporation, from his ambassadorship at Vatican City.

The Vatican—as is evidenced by the enclyclical of 1932, by the constant attacks on the Soviet Union from the Vatican, by its constant incitement to a "holy war"—would bring all the imperialist powers together in one common front against the Land of Socialism. The policy of the Papacy is to revive the anti-Comintern Pact on a wider basis. At the same time, it would bring the American state under the dominance of the Church, in the course of such a "crusade" against "atheistic communism." This common front of the imperialists is also the cherished ambition of Wall Street, more and more openly expressed by the White House. The menace in this barbarous campaign has to be brought vividly to the attention of the American people, to the end that they insist vigorously and effectively that the Taylor mission be recalled.

Let the American common people, including American Catholics, reassert their defense of the fundamental Jeffersonian principles which are basic to the life of real American democracy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IMPACT OF THE WAR ON THE STRUCTURE OF CAPITALISM

BY GEORGE BRAHNS

WRITING of the precipitous fall of business activity since last December, one of the most astute finance capitalists in America, the president of the Cleveland Trust Company, Colonel Ayres, gives in the March *Bulletin* of the bank the following interpretation:

"It seems probable that if this decline is to be promptly checked, and production trends turned upward again, the reversal must result from some new powerful and positive force. Such an upturn might come from a new wave of business confidence generated by a domestic political development. Perhaps a new upturn might be induced by large-scale pump-priming. It might come from suddenly increased war orders."

The Basic Capitalist Contradiction Erupts in War

Colonel Ayres was one of the arch-enemies of the New Deal. Hence, when he poses the alternatives of large-scale pump-priming or suddenly increased war orders he counts on the latter.

Which shows that at a certain juncture finance capital envisages only one way to disentangle itself from the contradictions generated by the capitalist system—the way of war.

It testifies to the fact that the same contradiction of capitalism that makes for cyclical crises makes, at a higher stage, for war.

What is this contradiction, which arises from the fundamental contradiction of capitalism—that between the socialized character of production and private appropriation?

It is the contradiction between steadily increasing productive capacity on the one hand and lagging markets on the other. It is expressed economically in the ever-widening gulf between agriculture and industry as well as between the production of the means of production (division I) and the production of the means of consumption (division II) in capitalism.

A cyclical crisis is the momentary eruptive solution of this contradiction, laying the ground at the same time for the intensification of the same contradiction, for a new and deeper crisis on a larger scale.

What is the course of the cycle, under "normal" conditions, as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shown in the movements of divisions I and II?

Production, having outstripped the limits of consumption in the boom, slows up until on a new level consumption catches up again with production. The sudden halt in the race of production occurs to the greatest extent in the field of machine production, construction of industrial plants, and heavy industry in general (division I). This accentuates the downward spiral of production, sales and employment: the crisis is in full swing.

Why does the setback begin, why is the crisis precipitated, in these branches of industry? The explanation lies in the greater elasticity of the demands for their products. The urgency of the needs for these products grows and falls directly in proportion to the profits and profit chances of the capitalists. As soon as, due to a glut in the markets, prices and profits decline, capitalists curtail their orders for the products of heavy industry. It is far easier for the capitalists to restrict temporarily the operation of plants and machinery (the more so since they shift the burden to the workers they discharge and whose wages they cut) than it is for the masses to dispense with the necessaries of life.

The demand for consumption goods (division II) is less elastic. For this reason production falls in a crisis at a faster rate than consumption, just as in the upward movement production grows at a faster rate than consumption, leading to the boom and the new setback.

Thus, the crisis, by cutting into division I more sharply than into division II, into production, particularly into production of the means of production, more sharply than into consumption, resolves the contradiction temporarily by forcing production down beneath the requirements of consumption.

From this bottom of the crisis a new cycle starts. The crisis has intensified the competition among the capitalists, helped to eliminate the weaker ones and to concentrate capital in fewer hands. It is from this capital concentration that the new spurt originates. But this capital concentration is greatest in division I. Hence in the new upward movement the gap between divisions I and II widens again to a greater extent than in the last cycle.

However, this description of the normal course of the crisis has to be qualified theoretically with regard to, as it is modified practically by, the general crisis of capitalism. Under the conditions of the general crisis of the capitalist system the cyclical crisis is a momentary eruption of the contradiction, but it no longer functions as its even temporary solution, at any rate not to the required extent. The destructive and disruptive force of the crisis outweighs under these conditions its function as a temporary solution of the contradiction.

The process now takes place under conditions in which capital concentration, particularly in the all-important division I, has reached the degree of monopoly. The monopolies carry, even at the height of the boom, large excess

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capacity. They dominate the market to such an extent that the losses incurred in a crisis are no longer borne mainly by their weaker competitors, nor can they be shifted altogether to them. Hence the monopolists seek to obviate these losses from the outset simply by excessively restricting production, thereby augmenting their unused excess capacity which they drag through the crisis in idleness. The bottom of the crisis now sinks deeper for this reason. Thus in the monopoly stage of capitalism, the gap between division I and division II is not closed but widened in the crisis.

The counterpart of this process is, of course, greater unemployment and a greater fall in the purchasing power of the people accentuated by monopolistic prices.*

The same contradiction, with the same modification in the general crisis, holds true to an increased degree for war.

The vulgar petty bourgois "theory of purchasing power" readily "resolves" the contradiction in the abstract, *i.e.*, apart from the capitalist system and the resistance of the capitalists. It advocates an increase in the purchasing power of the masses and hence an increase in the absorption capacity of the market as the "peaceful way," the reformist blueprint for reconciling the contradiction. This scheme is doomed to failure because it disregards the capitalist system, the resistance of the capitalists.

The contradiction can be resolved practically by struggle—a struggle of the masses for increased purchasing power that reckons with the capitalist system and with the resistance of the capitalists not, however, in order to stop short in the fight, but in order to sharpen its weapons by this insight and to raise the struggle to a higher level. In its complete unfolding this struggle achieves the definitive solution of the contradiction in the abolition of capitalism.

The ruling finance oligarchy puts up a stiff resistance to attempts at

* The interaction between the general crisis of capitalism and the cyclical crisis is shown in the classical analysis of the great economic crisis given by Joseph Stalin in 1934, at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

"How is the unprecedently protracted character of the present industrial crisis to be explained?

"It is to be explained first of all by the fact that the industrial crisis affected every capitalist country without exception and made it difficult for some countries to maneuver at the expense of others.

"Secondly, it is to be explained by the fact that the industrial crisis became interwoven with the agrarian crisis which affected all the agrarian and semi-agrarian countries without exception, and this could not but make the industrial crisis more complicated and profound.

"Thirdly, it is to be explained by the fact that the agrarian crisis became more acute in this period and affected all branches of agriculture including cattle-raising, degrading it to the level of passing from machine labor to hand labor, to the substitution of the horse for the tractor, to the sharp diminution in the use of and sometimes to the complete abandonment of artificial fertilizers, which caused the industrial crisis to become still more protracted.

"Fourthly, it is to be explained by the fact that the monopolist cartels which dominate industry strive to maintain the high prices of goods, and this circumstance makes the crisis particularly painful and hinders the absorption of stocks of commodities.

"Lastly, and what is most important, it is to be explained by the fact that the industrial crisis broke out amidst the conditions of the *general* crisis of capitalism, when capitalism no longer has, nor can have, either in the home states or in the colonial and dependent countries the strength and stability it had before the war and the October Revolution, when industry in the capitalist countries is suffering from the heritage it received from the imperialist war in the shape of the chronic working of enterprises under capacity, and of an army of unemployed numbering millions from which it is no longer able to release itself." (*Socialism Victorious*, pp. 3-4, International Publishers, New York.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolving the contradiction in such a way. In its fight against such a solution finance capital goes to any length—including war and fascism. The history of the defeat of the People's Front in France at the hands of the Two Hundred Families and of the onslaught by the "Sixty Families" upon the progressive measures of the New Deal proves that conclusively.

The remedy advocated and practiced by capital is: Cutting down purchasing power and increasing production (thus intensifying the contradiction and preparing a new crisis). The requirements of capital allow no other way out.

Switching the economy to war needs achieves just that. The case was clearly, even if brazenly, formulated by "One-Vote" Reynaud in his first speech in the Chamber of Deputies, summing up the program of his Cabinet. Promising to unleash a "total war," he enjoined the people "to produce more and consume less." The capitalist standpoint, in peace and war, cannot be epitomized better. Except that in war its spokesmen dare to formulate it bluntly and enforce it with open terror.

The Switch to War Economy

What takes place economically in the course of this switching to war economy?

First of all, a large-scale shift of production to division I, the production of the means of production. Division II, the production of consumption goods, becomes the crippled appendage of division I. The great underlying fact of the capitalist process of production, *the anarchy of production,* surges to the surface here and becomes apparent. The production of the means of production no longer serves eventually the needs of consumption, but the curtailing of consumption is harnessed to increase production. A capitalist paradise, even if it is hell for the people. This shift is accompanied by a great acceleration of the turnover of capital, which is due to the *faster pace* of a *different kind* of consumption. Instead of life necessaries, death necessaries are produced now. They are consumed, of course, at a much faster rate. It requires immeasurably shorter time for bombs to explode, to kill men and destroy cities, than it takes to consume food, wear out clothing and use up houses.

The market, and for once a steadily expanding market, is secured and guaranteed, the state being the chief customer. Again, the capitalists have nothing to worry about—for the time being. We have to do here with the harnessing of the state to create and enforce the most favorable conditions of capitalist accumulation. It is accumulation via the state apparatus. The mechanism consists of the state apparatus draining away, in the form of taxes and war loans, the purchasing power of the people and transmitting it in turn to the monopolists in the form of profitable war orders and subsidies. This is the financial counterpart of "producing more and consuming less."

All the financial "wizardry," all the tricks of war financing boil

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down to these fundamentals, mentioned above.

An example of such "wizardry" is the Keynes plan of compulsory "saving" of wages in England. In its revised, milder form, it envisages a compulsory withdrawal of six hundred million pounds from the payrolls in the first year of the war. The only difference between the liberal economist of Britain and the more rabid finance capitalist spokesmen in Germany and France is one of terminology. Where Goering says "Cannon instead of butter" and where Reynaud says "Produce more and consume less," Keynes changes the original label of his scheme, "compulsory saving," to a "liberal" label—"deferred pay"!

The second "concession" which sugar-coats this downright robbery of the workers for war purposes is that the sums of these wage deductions would not be deposited in the Post Office Savings Bank but with the trade unions (!), building cooperative societies, etc., which in turn would sink them in war loans. (We can hear Major Attlee and Sir Walter Citrine already exclaiming: "Socialism in our time.")

An added "attractive feature" of the plan is the promise that the "deferred pay" will be returned after the war. The British working class is forced to exchange six hundred million pounds for moonshine. To satisfy the "socialistic" aspirations of the Attlees and Citrines completely, the promise of a capital levy—after the war, of course—is thrown in for good measure.

The following tabulation shows how the budgets of the belligerent powers are swelled by war finance:

Governmental Expenditures (in Respective National Currencies)
(In Millions)

Fiscal Year Ending	*United Kingdom (Mar.)*	*France (Dec.)*	*Germany (Mar.)*	*Japan (Mar.)*
1929	703	45,400	11,350	1,736
1936	763	56,000	12,000	2,206
1937	817	66,000	13,000	2,799
1938	898	82,000	17,000	4,731
1939	1,055	95,000	29,000	8,138
1940	1,933	330,000	34,000	9,409
1941	3,200	.....	.....	10,360

The National City Bank, from whose March *Bulletin* these figures are taken, comments on the dimensions of these budgetary outlays for war:

"Although military operations on the Western Front are not yet on the 1918 scale, and commodity prices are only about half as high as then, nevertheless the war costs of the belligerent powers are already approximating those of the last year of the World War and still rising."

The actual process behind the figures in the table is divulged in the cynical manner of finance capitalists whose most secret dreams have suddenly come true:

"It should be remembered that the direct war costs have some off-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sets—in the savings resulting from drastic suppression of non-essential spending and in the willingness of the people to work harder and longer and thus increase the national output." *(Ibid.)*

The contradiction making for cyclical crises is temporarily overcome in a war economy by a sudden increase out of all proportions, of division I at the expense of division II (or, to translate the economic terms into social ones, by a sudden increase, out of all proportion, of accumulation and profits at the expense of the people's living standard). That is, *the cyclical crisis is temporarily avoided at the price of an extreme distortion of the structure, the extreme sharpening of the structural contradiction* (the widening gulf betwen division I and division II). Thus, the process is heading towards an inevitable economic catastrophe.

The Weakened Structure of Capitalism in the Second Imperialist War

Let us illustrate this point. The first imperialist war left its indelible stamp on the British economic structure in the form of the notorious "distressed areas," centers of chronic structural unemployment at the seats of the great traditional "old industries," coal, textile, shipbuilding, iron—graveyard signs of "Old England."

Stagnating and decaying parasitic British capital seizes upon the "golden opportunity" of the second imperialist war to solve this contradiction in its own way by the war economy, a contradiction which it was utterly and organically incapable of solving in the framework of its peace-time economy.

The "old industries" might be flourishing again in a war boom; yet this is a mere shot in the arm of decadent British capitalism, a doctoring of the symptoms while the organism itself sinks deeper. The accentuation of the structural contradiction is the price to be paid for this temporary overcoming of the cyclical crisis; with the inevitable consequence that when the time comes to switch back again to peace-time economy *the whole of British capitalism will emerge as one single gigantic distressed area!*

Averting the catastrophe will be the urgent task of the proletarian revolution in Britain!

Generally speaking, a weakened and less resilient structure of capitalist economy meets the impact of the second imperialist war. There was no structural, chronic mass unemployment in the advanced capitalist countries prior to the outbreak of the first world imperialist war. This new phenomenon, this novel feature of the capitalist structure, is the result of that war, as is its counterpart, the chronic excess capacity of the production apparatus in the capitalist countries!

This has at once two consequences: it affects, first, the character of the war boom itself. The captains and hired spokesmen of capitalism did not come out so openly at the beginning of the first imperialist war with the slogan: "Produce more, consume less." The war boom then meant, at least in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its first phases, the disappearance of unemployment and increased wages (even though hopelessly lagging behind the inflationary soaring of the costs of living). At the beginning of the second imperialist war the unfolding war boom did not even materially reduce unemployment.

This question is particularly acute in this country with the abandoning of the New Deal and the switching over to the war budget. The incipient war boom, far from helping the American farmer, has actually injured him, by cutting off his remaining foreign markets. The promise held out to him for better business after the war has developed into full blast cannot materialize. The intensified blockade will cut into agricultural markets even more deeply and the Allies will spend all the money they have and all the credits they can get here for airplanes and ammunition and not for foodstuffs.

The hope of the advocates of a slash in relief appropriations, that increased war orders will take a huge number of people off the relief rolls is idle. The C.I.O. and W.P.A. Administrator Harrington concur in this opinion.

"So serious is the situation regarded that Ralph Hetzel, C.I.O. employment director, announced he would devote virtually his entire testimony before the subcommittee tomorrow to showing a war boom would not materially affect workers now on relief rolls.

"W.P.A. Commissioner Harrington also is expected to mention the subject as he concluded his testimony at a closed session today. According to reliable reports, he will maintain that with at least 10,000,000 unemployed in the country, industries manufacturing war supplies will not be able to absorb many relief workers." (*New York Post*, April 10, 1940.)

Can Capitalism Switch Back to a Peace Economy?

The second consequence of the general crisis of capitalism: the intensified structural contradiction as the legacy of the first world imperialist war, is that with the impact of the further structural distortion, the switching back to peace economy will encounter insuperable obstacles of a subjective and objective, of a political and economic nature.

For this objective reason of the changing structure of capitalism brought about by war economy, it is reasonable to expect that the period of "demobilization," of switching back to peace economy, will witness a struggle, greatly intensified in character, between the proletariat and the bourgoisie *around the all-important question of who should direct this switching back process and in whose interest:* the forces that dragged the people into the holocaust or its victims, the forces that fought for its termination.

Lloyd George, Britain's war-time Premier, goaded the British people, at the end of the first imperialist war, with the demagogic promise: "The Kaiser will pay." The British working class learned the lesson in the meantime. They know by now that the Kaiser enjoys his restored private fortune in Holland and figures in certain Allied circles as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"lesser evil" against Hitler (the idea of monarchical restoration being thought of in Allied circles as a safeguard against the looming German social revolution), and that it was *they*, the British workers, who *paid*, with the distressed areas, with the means test and the dole. They are bent on preventing a repetition of the spectacle, enacted with success after the first World War by the "Welsh wizard."

Catching Up With Fascism

The following tabulation shows the different degrees of the development of the crisis on the basis of the gap between divisions I and II:

*Indices of Production and Consumption Goods (1st quarter 1938)** *(1929 = 100)*

P.I.—Producers' Investment Goods; Auto—Automobiles; Bldg.—Building; C.C.—Current Consumption Goods.

	P. I.	*Auto*	*Bldg.*	*C. C.*
United States	45.4	44.7	41.0	80.0
Great Britain	132.4	215.2	141.7	127.7
France	73.0	74.9	40.1	71.5
Germany	126.3	218.4	87.7	113.0
Italy	113.1	155.4	59.1	104.3
Japan (1930 = 100)	290.6	.....	.....	137.4

We have here two groups of countries: those whose economy was already switched completely to war needs, Germany, Japan, Italy, and those that are as yet only in the initial phases of the process, the United States, Great Britain and France.

Among the latter group we have two countries where, by the struggle of the people, an attempt was made to allay the crisis through increasing the purchasing power of the masses and where these efforts were defeated by the finance oligarchy: the United States and France. The figures reflect the sabotage of the monopolists in these countries.

Accordingly, we have in the case of Germany, Japan, and Italy a growing divergence between divisions I and II as the result of war economy. Significantly, we have the same divergence, even if at a lesser rate, in the case of Great Britain. There, economic war preparation had just started in earnest and every attempt at the creation of a People's Front, at increasing the purchasing power of the masses was nipped in the bud by the ruling class with the help of the reformist labor leaders who preferred the "normal" capitalist way out of the crisis: cutting down purchasing power and increasing production in heavy industry by subsidies and tariffs.

The sabotage against the progressive social legislation of the People's Front in France and in the United States by the finance oligarchies accounts for the reverse widening of the gap between the two divisions by cutting down heavily on invest-

* League of Nations, *World Production and Prices*, 1937-38, pp. 124-25.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment and production in heavy industry.

Consequently, we find that these are the two countries where, in *consequence of the sit-down strike of big capital*, employment in industry remained considerably below the level of 1929 (by almost the same margin):

*Employment in Industry in 1938**
(1929 = 100)

U.S.A.	81.9
Britain (1930 = 100)	104.1
Italy	111.1
France (1930 = 100)	81.2
Germany	117.4
Japan	154.1

After the outbreak of the war the transformation into war economy was being speeded up tremendously in the United States, Britain, and France. The finance oligarchies in these countries are determined to catch up, whatever the cost in "blood and treasure" (both being drained, in the spirit of "national unity," from the people).

This speeding-up process cannot, of course, be maintained under the conditions of a military stalemate like that which, consequent upon the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, prevailed in the first seven months of the war. This was one weighty reason for British and French capital to do everything in their power to create new war fronts and thus unleash the "total war." Similarly, it was a weighty reason for American capital, after having taken the first fateful step on the road to war economy, to connive with the Allies in this conspiracy against the life of the people.

The Impending Catastrophe

Thus the seeds are being sown once again for general economic chaos in the capitalist world.

Withal, the anarchy of production, inherent in the capitalist mode of production, increases behind the facade of war regimentation to the point of a manifest crisis of the *system*. The hired spokesmen of the French finance oligarchy, who under the regime of the People's Front raised a hue and cry about economic chaos (that they themselves engineered in order to undermine the economic achievements of the people), want us now to be gullible enough to believe in the miracle of an instantaneous change from chaos to "order" simply by changing over to war economy. No, by this change the eventual chaos is being made overwhelming and irreparable.

The magic switch to war economy does not create order out of the chaos. The resources of the nation can be employed for war purposes, capitalism can be made to serve the purposes of war just as war is made to serve the purposes of capitalism. Yet all this is already the agony of the system, a headlong clash between the requirements of capital and the life requirements of the people.

The question is: where is the breaking point? Where does the latent chaos, conjured up by switching over to war economy, become actual? Where is the point at

* *Statistical Year Book of the League of Nations*, 1938-39, p. 67.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the structural changes brought about by war economy tear the structure itself asunder? The answer does not depend on economic factors alone. The capitalist structure itself is not a mere economic category. Class antagonism is one of its main factors.

War Economy Rests on Class Collaboration

Class collaboration is the mainstay of the capitalist structure in a war economy. Without the services of the Blums and Jouhaux, of the Attlees and Citrines, the British and French finance oligarchy would not be able to undertake to salvage their system through war. That accounts likewise for the role of Green, Dubinsky, *et. al.*, in the war drive of Wall Street.

Everything that goes wrong in a war economy (and everything is bound to go wrong at one time or another) can be mended, the tottering structure can be propped up, provided the people, and the working class in particular, do not interfere actively. The miraculous order presented by war economy, the streamlined efficiency of the war machine depends upon one factor and lasts only as long as that lasts: the stranglehold of the finance oligarchy over the working class through the agency of the social-imperialists. This is the basic social factor of the structure of capitalist war economy. The structure itself is disrupted if this stranglehold is broken by the active interference of the working class with the "war effort."

Let's illustrate this point. Lloyd George describes in his war memoirs how he went about his task when in 1916 he was appointed Prime Minister and called upon to clear up the hopeless mess in which the British war effort bogged down at the time. The first thing he did was to invite the top labor leadership to a conference, solicit their increased collaboration and invite them into the war council.

That was, however, not sufficient. Some recalcitrant sections of the working class had to be "brought to reason." There was a strike going on on the Clyde for higher wages and better conditions, and against war profiteering. With one of the top labor leaders Lloyd George went down to the Clyde to negotiate with the workers' delegates personally. At last, with the aid of the labor leader he succeeded in swinging them into line. With the exception of one. Lloyd George singles him out in his memoirs as having been in spite of his "perfect manners" "the most sinister influence." This man was William Gallacher.

Gallacher is at present the Communist Member of Parliament. The only one; yet he was sent to Parliament by those workers at the Clyde side whose interests and anti-war struggle he steadfastly represented during the first imperialist war with his "perfect manners" as well as with his "most sinister influence." And that bodes ill for the present war effort of the British bourgeoisie.

One other important point has to be added. As class collaboration is the indispensable prerequisite of prosecuting the war, the mainstay

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the capitalist structure in a war economy, so in turn war becomes increasingly the requisite for maintaining this class collaboration. And that lengthens the duration of the war, militating from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie against an "early peace." This is most evident in the present set-up in France. There the fascist persecution of the mighty Party of the working class, the Communists, and the prosecution of the war—for both of which the help of the Social-Democratic leadership is vital—are most clearly the two interdependent sides of the structure under discussion. The structure is based on "national unity," *i.e.*, the ruthless subjection of the working class to the unified forces of reaction. True, it is possible only as long as the war lasts, yet the war can last only as long as this subjection can be maintained. Again, the resistance by the working class bodes ill for the war effort of the French bourgeoisie.

The World Market Undermined Through the Struggle for Its Redivision

It is beyond the scope of this article to deal with the changes that the structure of *world capitalism* is subjected to in this war. We can point out here only the basic fact, that the contradiction between increasing producing capacity and narrowing markets is reproduced and tremendously accentuated *on a world scale* by the war. The war serves to redivide the world market, not, however, to expand it. On the contrary.

This was demonstrated by the first imperialist war; this is the *cause* of the outbreak of the second. The briefest consideration of the character and direction of post-War capital export from the chief creditor countries, Britain and the United States, serves to illustrate the point. It did not develop "new markets." It went largely to Europe, especially Germany, to Canada and Latin America. Britain exported capital to the United States.

This became clearly evident after the onset of the great crisis in 1929, with the mass defaults of the European and Latin American debtors. The expansion of the market by this kind of capital export turned out to be a complete illusion. In the sharpened struggle for markets, the defaulting debtors protected their home markets and their deteriorating currencies through tariffs and quotas. The creditor countries protected their markets even more vigorously from being flooded by the desperate export efforts of the debtor countries.

It is no accident that the mass default of the debtor nations around 1931, the narrowing down of the markets by the erection of new walls of protectionism all over the world coincided exactly with the emergence of fascism in Germany and the opening of the second imperialist war by Japanese aggression against China.

All of which means that the structure of world capitalism became so shaky as to give way to the only remaining "remedy" of bankrupt imperialism—war. It can hardly withstand the impact of it with-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out breaking at one or at several of its weakest links.

The interval between the first and the second imperialist wars was both too short and too long to be even a temporary solution of the crisis of capitalism. Too short, for it is the same generation still that went through the hell of the first war and learned the lesson of imperialist war and imperialist peace. Too long, for it enabled the victorious working class of the Soviet Union to build and entrench firmly socialism; it enabled the proletariat in the capitalist countries to strengthen its forces and to develop its vanguard, the Communist Party; it enabled the national liberation struggle of the Chinese and the Indian peoples to unfold to an unprecedented degree. This is portentous for the fate of world imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ZIONISM AND THE IMPERIALIST WAR

BY PAUL NOVICK

I

ON SEPTEMBER 9, 1939, the Zionist Jewish Agency for Palestine issued the following appeal:

"Fate has decreed!

"His Majesty's Government today declared war against Hitler Germany.

"In this critical hour the Jewish community is called upon to institute a triple guard: for the defense of the fatherland, for the peace of the Jewish people and for the victory of the British Empire."

To leave no room for doubt as to what the Zionist Jewish Agency meant, the head of this agency in Palestine, the "Socialist" David Ben Gurion, issued a call, "War and the Jews in Palestine," outlining the views of official Zionism on the present war and the role Zionist leadership has assigned to the Jewish people. In this call, published in the "Labor" Zionist *Jewish Frontier* for November, 1939, Ben Gurion states:

"There can be no difference of opinion regarding the complete solidarity betwen Jews and the British in this war. With no less fervor than any Englishman does every Jew pray now for the victory of the British Empire. It is not only a common enemy which binds us to England, but also the fact that the Jewish people cannot forget that Great Britain was first to recognize us as a people, to reaffirm our historic connection with *Eretz Israel* [the land of Israel] and to help us in no small measure to rebuild our Homeland.

"Our fate is bound to that of Great Britain. Her war is our war."

Ben Gurion's statement is a libelous attack on the Jewish people. It is not true that "every Jew" is praying "for the victory of the British Empire," or that Jews generally are engaged in that pursuit. It is most emphatically not the case. Certainly, Jews in the United States, even conservative Jews, are least of all worried about the fate of the British Empire. Ben Gurion merely expresses the policies of official Zionism. He gives a clear picture of the role the *Zionist leadership* has assumed.

The White Paper issued by the Chamberlain Government in May, 1939, aiming at the destruction of the National Home it promised to Zionism, did not stop the true servants of British imperialism from offering their services and their prayers as soon as war was declared. The "appeal" of the Jewish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Agency follows its call "for the victory of the British Empire" with a reference to the White Paper, hastening to emphasize that "our opposition to the policy of the White Paper was not directed against England and the British Empire." On the strength of this White Paper the British Government on February 28 issued an order restricting the sale of lands to Jews in a majority of districts in Palestine (retroactive as of May, 1939). This edict evoked a wave of protest meetings and demonstrations on the part of the aroused Jews in this British imperialist colony. The result: 397 Jews were wounded, two of whom subsequently died. Among the wounded there was the leader of the Left Poale Zion (Workers of Zion) Zrubovel; the secretary of the workers' council in Tel Aviv, Lipshitz; and the poetess Alisheva. The Zionist leadership exerted all its efforts to muffle the outcry of the Palestinian Jews. The bloody treatment Chamberlain accorded the Palestinian Jews (true to tsarist or Hitlerist style) made no impression on his servants. No protest meetings or demonstrations or picketing of consulates was organized in the United States. The president of the world Zionist organization, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, in a speech delivered at Symphony Hall, in Boston, on March 3, stated:

"Whatever the provocation, I and those whom I represent will not deviate from the position enunciated in my letter to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain at the outbreak of the war. Our loyalty to the Allied cause remains steadfast." (*New York Herald Tribune*, March 4.)

No amount of humiliation and of persecution of Jews on the part of British imperialism, not even bloodshed will halt the services and prayers of the Weizmanns and Ben Gurions.

Is there anything new in this role of the Zionist leadership, a role of servants of imperialism?

II

In a letter addressed to the German Kaiser in September, 1897, Dr. Theodore Herzl states that with Zionist settlement in Palestine, German influence will come into that country. The letter was not dispatched, as Herzl confesses in his diaries, but it represented the view expressed by him to sundry people who were in a position to reach the ear of the Kaiser. Thus, in his entry of September 3, 1897, he relates in his *Tagebuecher* (Vol. V, p. 109), an interview with the Grand Duke of Baden: "I particularly drew attention to the fact that with the Jews there will come to the Orient *German* influence."

Dr. Herzl was the founder and, until his death in 1904, the revered head of the world Zionist movement. He laid the basis for "political Zionism" with his booklet *Judenstaat* (*Jewish State*), published in 1895. He was instrumental in the convening of the first Zionist Congress in 1896 at Basle, where the program of his *Judenstaat* was adopted. He went from duke to prince, from the Sultan to the Kaiser in quest of a charter for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Palestine. He visited the tsarist Minister of Interior Von Plehve shortly after the Kishinev Pogrom, of which Von Plehve was the instigator. He called congress after congress of the world Zionist movement, which he inspired.

What he said to the Kaiser and to the Grand Duke gives us some idea of his political credo and tactics. However, the character of the founder of the Zionist movement, who until this day remains a source of inspiration for Zionist leadership, will be best depicted by what he himself says in that bible of Zionism, *Judenstaat*:

"Suppose His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine," he dreams, "we should there form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism." (p. 29, English edition.) . . . "I think a democratic monarchy and an aristocratic republic are the two most superior forms of a state. . . . I am a staunch supporter of monarchical institutions because these allow a continuity of policy." (p. 86.)

In his diaries he is more outspoken: "Democracy is political nonsense which could only be decided upon by a mob during revolutionary excitement." (Vol. I, p. 141.)

Clearly, we have to do with a reactionary, a servitor of imperialism. But it will be worthwhile to examine the antics of this Dr. Herzl a bit closer. In his letter to the Kaiser he also states:

"If the German Jews emigrate, this will cause the return of the German-American emigrants. In this way you will gain *unadulterated nationals*, you prevent a collapse which might be difficult to limit, you *weaken socialism*, to which the persecuted Jews have turned because other parties have expelled them, and you gain time to solve the social question." (My emphasis—*P.N.*)

Herzl never tired of pointing out the role of Zionism as an instrument against socialism, for diverting the attention of the Jewish people from revolutionary activities. In his letter to the Kaiser one can clearly discern streaks of *racism*. Herzl offers the Kaiser an inducement: In place of Jews he will gain "unadulterated nationals."

A few more points of information about this founder of Zionism. In his diaries he speaks of the custom of dueling which he will introduce into Palestine. He devotes a full page to the various forms of dueling which he will permit:

"I need the duel, in order to have proper officers and in order to refine the tone of good society on the French model. . . . I shall make our high priests wear imposing ceremonial dress; and our Curiassiers wear yellow trousers, white tunics; officers with silver curiasses." (p. 46.)

Herzl was a member of the editorial staff of the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse*, organ of Austro-German imperialism. For a time he was the correspondent of this newspaper in Paris. He was all for Austro-German imperial interests and he really meant to introduce German influence into Palestine and the Near East. In the interview granted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to him by the Kaiser while on a visit to Jerusalem, Herzl most positively pressed home the point he mentioned in his unmailed letter and in the interview with the Grand Duke of Baden.

At the beginning the Kaiser tended to scorn Zionist services. The Polish Zionist, Dr. Joshua Thon, in his reminiscences of Dr. Herzl, relates what the Polish politician Trapczinski, who was a member of the Reichstag before the war and had access to the Kaiser, told him regarding this matter. The impression Herzl made on the Kaiser was a rather comical one, Trapczinski said. German imperialism at that time was introducing German influence into Palestine through German farm settlements (some of them are still in existence near Jaffa) and by establishing various religious institutions in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and other parts of the "Holy Land." It was only later, prior to and during the World War, that German imperialism grew more alert to the Zionist movement, realizing that it could be utilized as an instrument in the struggle against British imperialism for the "Berlin-Bagdad line" and domination of the Near East.

Zionist leadership under Herzl and, after Herzl's death under David Wolfsohn, continuing to orient itself to German imperialism, was willing. The Zionist movement itself was definitely a Germanizing factor. The official language of the Zionist Congress and *Congress Bulletin* was German. The central organ was published in German (*Die Welt*). There was an attempt to Germanize the Hebrew schools of Palestine in 1913.

During the war, when Turkey was allied to Germany the hopes of the Zionist leadership were raised.

"The German Government was fully alive to the importance of rallying Jewish opinion to her side," the Zionist Revisionist William B. Ziff states in his *The Rape of Palestine* (Longmans, Green, 1938): "The German ruler had once declared to Herzl when he came back from Palestine that he was willing to undertake the 'mandate' for the Zionist settlement in Palestine if Turkey would agree. News reached the British Foreign Office that Baron Rosen, German Ambassador to the Hague, had been in conference with leading Dutch Jews." (p. 55.)

After the Balfour Declaration was issued by the British Government on November 2, 1917, promising Palestine as a "national home" for the Jewish people, the German Government made several other overtures. On December 17, 1917, Talaat Pasha told a correspondent of the *Vossische Zeitung* that he was prepared to offer German Zionists some form of chartered company with local self-government of a limited character and rights of immigration into Palestine. By July, 1918, the German Government finally secured the concessions from Turkey, but by that time Palestine was already in the hands of the Allies. As a matter of fact the scales were tipped with the entry of the United States into the war. Hegemony of Zionism def-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

initely went to pro-British bourgeois Jewish leaders. With the defeat of German imperialism the pro-German element in Zionism was reduced to a minimum.

III

That the Balfour Declaration was issued by the British Government as a means of gaining support in the world imperialist war against Germany is now generally admitted. The Royal Commission itself (Peel Commission) in its report issued in July, 1937, frankly admits that: "The Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917 in order to enlist the Jewish support for the Allies" (p. 24); that the British were afraid that "Syria and Palestine might be made the base for Turko-German attack on the Suez Canal." The war-time Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lloyd George, in a statement in the House of Commons on June 19, 1936, was even more candid: "It was important for us to seek every legitimate help we could get. We came to the conclusion from information we received from every part of the world that it was vital we should have the sympathies of the Jewish community."

But this truth was told—nineteen years later. In 1917, while still Prime Minister, Lloyd George, like Lord Arthur Balfour and the other builders of the Empire, engaged in the most grandiloquent talk calculated to create the "necessary" illusions among the persecuted Jews in the various countries of Europe and among Jews generally. Great Britain was nothing but the savior of the Jewish people, with no interests of its own in the matter of Palestine. "Great Britain extended its mighty hand in friendship to the Jewish people to help it to regain its ancient national home and to realize its age-old aspiration," Lloyd George loftily declared. Bourgeois Zionist leadership kept up a constant tom-tom among the Jewish people to arouse enthusiasm for the Allies, through meetings, parades, celebrations and what-not. The Zionist following sincerely seeking a solution for the suffering Jewish people was kept in a state of exaltation, ready for any sacrifice for the cause of Great Britain and its allies. Britain was the Great Liberator! The end of persecution was in sight!

Nor was this all. Zionist leadership undertook to mislead thousands of Jewish youth who enlisted in a Jewish regiment under the leadership of Vladimir Jabotinsky, at that time a member of the world Zionist executive. Many of these youth laid down their lives in order to help bring about the victory of British arms in Palestine.

Nor was this all. The late Jacob de Haas, a former secretary of Dr. Herzl and at the time of the World War one of the chief leaders of Zionism in the United States, admitted the following in 1928, after a series of disappointments with British policies:

"Did the British [during the war] need to obtain a contact in Odessa . . . a trustworthy agent in Harbin? . . . The New York office [of the Zionist organization] rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good-will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs." (The *Menorah Journal*, February, 1928.)

The implication of this is quite clear. De Haas' admission, by the way, substantiates the contention of Soviet authorities that the Zionist organization was and is acting as an agent of British imperialism, "in Odessa," etc., etc.

Did Zionist leadership really believe that Great Britain was merely interested in solving the Jewish problem and in establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine? Of course not! The Balfour Declaration was one of the shabbiest forms of British imperialist double-dealing, part of a whole line of trickery to mislead both Jews and Arabs. Prior to the Balfour Declaration (in 1916) there was the agreement between the British representative Sir Mark Sykes and the French representative Georges Picot, which provided for the division of the land bridge between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf into five distinct regions. According to this agreement Palestine was to be "subjected to a special régime to be determined by agreement between Russia, France and Great Britain."

Prior to this, in 1915, there was the promise made to the Arabs in the letter of the then British High Commissioner in Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon, addressed to the Arab King Hussein. The British Government claims that McMahon "meant" to exclude Palestine from the areas promised to the Arabs, but the letter was so phrased as to create the impression among the Arabs that Palestine was included.

Zionist leadership certainly knew about this letter. They knew that in 1917 British airplanes showered the Arab population with leaflets and proclamations signed by King Hussein. One of these proclamations, quoted in the Report of the British "Commission on Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929" (Shaw Commission), spoke of "liberating all Arabs from the Turkish rule"; it called upon the Arabs to fight for "the preservation of religion and the freedom of the Arabs generally"; it spoke of an "Arab kingdom." (p. 126.) This and similar proclamations were spread by the British among the Arabs in Palestine, as well as other regions of Arabistan. Some of the leaflets showered upon Palestine from British airplanes were addressed "To the Arab Officers and Soldiers in the Turkish Army in Palestine."

Zionist leadership certainly knew about these proclamations as well as about the activities of Lawrence of Arabia who, with the aid of enormous funds supplied by the British Government, was organizing the Arabs to fight the Turkish army. Lawrence was more lavish in his promises on behalf of the British Government than was Sir Henry McMahon. Zionist leaders who most certainly were kept informed by their representatives in Palestine and Egypt knew that the British Government was playing a double game. Soon after the Balfour Declaration was issued the Soviet Government, in publishing the secret documents of the tsar-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist Foreign Office, uncovered the Sykes-Picot agreement. Both before and after the declaration was issued the nefarious role played by British imperialism was known to Zionist leadership. The blind could see that even the wording of the declaration itself was part of the contemptibly tricky game to utilize both the yearning of the Jewish people for a solution of their problems and of the Arab people for independence. Nevertheless, the Weizmanns and the other leaders of Zionism kept up the harangue about the "glory" of this declaration and the "liberation" British Government has promised, guaranteed, etc.

Anybody at all acquainted with the struggle between German and British imperialism for the railway to Bagdad knew that the British Government was interested in securing Palestine for itself, for British imperialism. Palestine is situated on the Suez Canal, athwart the life-line of the British Empire. It is the only section of Arabistan (outside of Syria held by the French) facing the Mediterranean Sea. It is situated along the land-route to India. It possesses the Harbor of Haifa where the pipe-line for Mosul oil, in Iraq (Mesopotamia), terminates. Palestine is a most valuable strategic position for British imperialism. This was well known in 1917. Chatham House in London, which represents the unofficial forum for the builders of the Empire, admits all that and even more in its report, *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1936*. Palestine, the report says, is vital "for the whole British Commonwealth with its . . . Moslem population of 100,000,000." (p. 9.) Opponents of Zionism, prior to the Balfour declaration and particularly afterwards, kept pointing out the true role of British imperialism in relation to Palestine. Zionist leadership would have none of that. They had nothing but hallelujahs for British imperialism.

Soon after the declaration British imperialist provocations began to bear fruit. There was bloodshed in Palestine in 1920, there was bloodshed in 1921, and there was more bloodshed in the ensuing years (1929, 1931, 1933, 1936-1938). Zionist leadership blamed everybody but British imperialism. They blamed the Mufti, forgetting that he was a creature of British imperialism, appointed to his post by the first British High Commissioner in Palestine, Sir Herbert Samuel, despite the opposition of the Moslem High Council at that time! (After the founding of the Communist Party in 1924, certain Zionist leaders at last discovered the culprit: the Communist Party!)

At no time would Dr. Weizmann and his fellow Zionist leaders permit themselves to take any action that might offend British imperialism. Dr. Weizmann was praised by Lloyd George for his services during the world imperialist war as chemist in the Admiralty Chemical Laboratories where he devised a substitute for the exhausted English supplies of acetone, used in making the basic material in gunpowder. After the war he helped British im-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialism supply the proper explosives for Palestine. The policy of Zionist leadership, particularly that of the "socialist" wing who to this day do not permit the admission of Arab workers into the labor unions of the Histadruth (Jewish Labor Federation), excellently serves the line of British imperialism: divide and rule.

On the eve of the second imperialist war, when agents of the British Colonial Office openly spoke of a "Jewish militia of fifty thousand men" which was being considered by "military experts" of Great Britain (cable by Augur, to the *New York Times* of January 19, 1936), Zionist leadership saw no cause for alarm or objection. On the contrary, the late Lord Melchett, a leader of British Zionism, stated in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* that the ". . . imperial solution of the Palestine problem would provide the British Empire with a healthy and intelligent population in the Near East always ready in the case of necessity to take up arms in an imperial cause."

In his *Thy Neighbor* (H. C. Kinsey & Co., 1937), Lord Melchett speaks at length of the benefits Zionism will bring to the British Empire also from a military standpoint. The President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Dr. J. L. Magnes, strongly took issue with Dr. Melchett. In a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* answering Melchett, Magnes ironically declared: "This poses the question very neatly."

Very neatly, indeed.

IV

"Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa . . . a trustworthy agent in Harbin? . . . The New York office rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and good will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs."

De Haas who wrote these lines was too modest. As one of the chief leaders of the Zionist organization of America at that time, he might have known that many an American Zionist leader was not at all content with the role of a servant of British imperialism.

For American imperialism, too, was interested in Palestine. The aforementioned report, *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1936*, discloses that President Wilson was not at all anxious to have Palestine secure for Britain.

"He sent a private American commission—under A. C. King and C. R. Crane—which received petitions and interviewed delegations all over Palestine in June-July, 1919. The chief points in the report affecting Palestine were strong sentiment favorable to complete independence for a United Syria (including Palestine) but if supervision were necessary, the United States was preferred, rather than Britain." (pp. 17-18.)

The interest President Wilson took in Syria and Palestine had little to do with solving the Jewish problem or any of the problems of persecuted nationalities. Mainly, it had to do with the famous Chester Concession and the interests of Standard Oil in the oil fields of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mosul-Iraq. The Chester Concession, granted by the Turkish Government to Rear Admiral Colby Chester in 1909 for the building of ports and railways and the exploitation of mines by American capital, covered a territory stretching from Angora down to Mosul and therefrom to the border of Persia. After the World War the Chester Grant again came to the fore. The Ottoman American Developing Co. was subsequently organized or reorganized, with General George W. Goethals as president. The concession was finally put into effect by order of the Turkish Government in 1923. The interests of Standard Oil in Mosul were the cause of a note addressed by Wilson's Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby (November 20, 1920) protesting to Great Britain against the exclusion of American interests from mandates established under the League of Nations. The particular object of Colby's protest was the understanding between Britain and France reached at San Remo, April 25, 1920, excluding Standard Oil from the Mosul oil deal.

American imperialism has always been alive to the importance of Palestine as a strategic position for the domination, commercial and otherwise, of the Near East, and one must either be naive or insincere to state as did de Haas that American Zionist leadership under Justice Brandeis and Judge Julien W. Mack "rendered all these services, asking nothing." De Haas, in his book, *Louis D. Brandeis*, informs us that it was under Brandeis' influence that Zionists went to Milwaukee in September, 1917, to assist Samuel Gompers in mobilizing the American labor movement for the imperialist war. The real purposes of that war have long been clearly established. President Wilson performed the task of supplying flowery "idealistic" messages and speeches to the prosaic interests of American monopoly capital. The letters of Bainbridge Colby recently published by the State Department offer additional material to establish the role of "idealistic" Wilsonism during the last World War. One can therefore be forgiven the suspicion that "idealistic" Zionist leadership connected with Wilsonism had at least some regard for "American interests" in the Near East.

Here perhaps is the key to the schism between the Brandeis-Mack faction of Zionism and Dr. Weizmann. The Brandeis-Mack faction split away from the Zionist organization of America (rather from Weizmannism), in 1921, when it was clearly established that the so-called Jewish National Home in Palestine was merely an instrument of British imperialism. Likewise, it had become clear that the world Zionist leadership under Dr. Weizmann had resolved not to be provoked regardless what British imperialism did to the Balfour Declaration and to Palestine itself.

What is true of the effect of imperialistic rivalries on Zionist developments in the United States is also true of France where the Zionist movement is extremely weak. French imperialism, as seen from the Sykes-Picot agreement of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1916 referred to earlier, staked much on obtaining Syria together with Palestine. In 1926, a representative of the French Government, in an interview with the then editor of the Palestine Hebrew daily, *Doar Hayom*, regretted the fact that such a leader of the bourgeois Jews in France as Sylvain Levi, did not understand Zionism. If he were to grasp the significance of Zionism, the French imperialist stated, Levi could have been at the head of world Jewry, thereby assisting in raising the "moral prestige" of France.

The Brandeis-Mack faction attempted to perform the task M. Levi failed to grasp, but without much success.

As an instrument and servant of imperialism, Zionism could not but be affected by the rivalries between British, French, and American finance capital. For the present, it is British imperialism which has sole claim to this instrument.

V

It is no wonder, then, that Zionism, with a record of imperialistic service—or aspirations to serve—with a program that requires the foisting of a Jewish majority over the Arab population of Palestine (as is implicit in Zionism and as was openly stated by one of its foremost leaders, M. Ussishkin*) should at an early stage develop expansionist aspirations—imperialism in embryo.

One must again turn to the "Socialist" Zionist leader, David Ben Gurion, who is often brutally outspoken. We heard him call for "a military alliance with England" for the purpose of securing "the victory of the British Empire." However, this is not his sole purpose.

In August, 1935, in a speech at the Nineteenth Zionist World Congress at Lucerne, Mr. Ben Gurion thus outlined the expansionist perspective of Zionism:

"The borders of Palestine do not extend from Dan to Beersheba, but from at least 250 kilometers farther south. The Red Sea has played a great part in Jewish history. During Solomon's time the first effort to create a Jewish fleet was made, but not with a Jewish personnel. We must not let ourselves be dominated by present-day conditions, but must hold to the historic line. Our economic structure, husbandry as well as industry, which is principally based on the home market in *Erez Israel* must seek a connection with the great hinterland of Palestine, with Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Persia, perhaps even with India. We must be independent of the artificial route of the Suez Canal. We must find our own way toward all the Asiatic countries." (*Kongresszeitung*, official organ of the Zionist Congress, No. 3, p. 4; also *Jewish Frontier*, October, 1935.)

Immediately after the issuance of the Balfour Declaration Dr. Weizmann made the statement that "Palestine is to be as Jewish as England is English" for which he was sharply called to order by Winston Churchill in his White Paper of June, 1922. Quite naturally, Zionistic expansionist aspirations came into conflict with British imperial interests just as Ben Gurion's sweep towards the Red Sea and

* *Palestine Undivided*, Tel Aviv, May, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beyond would unfailingly bring him into imperialist hot water. But the imperialistic and conquestadorian aspirations of Zionist leadership are there. More clearly are these aspirations, formulated by the Jewish fascist leader, Vladimir Jabotinsky, who openly advocates the removal, even by force, of Arabs, not merely from Palestine, but from Transjordania as well. Jabotinsky and his followers are openly advocating the slogan that Palestine must be conquered by the "sword." But this imperialistic, anti-Arab and anti-Jewish policy is simply Jabotinsky's old line. As far back as 1925, as head of the propaganda department of the world Zionist executive, Jabotinsky stated:

"Zionist colonization must be either terminated or carried out against the wishes of the native population. This colonization can, therefore, be continued and make progress only under the protection of a power independent of the native population—an iron wall which will be in a position to resist the pressure of the native population. This is, in toto, our policy towards the Arabs. . . . A voluntary reconciliation with the Arabs is out of the question either now or in the near future." (E. Liebenstein, *The Truth About Revisionism*, League for Labor Palestine, New York, 1935, p. 9.)

And again: "During colonization there is no justice, no law, no God in heaven" (p. 53), as Jabotinsky stated in 1923, in a speech in Tel Aviv, *while still a member of the world Zionist executive*. As head of his own New Zionist Organization (N.I.Z.O.), an out-and-out fascist body, he nevertheless was warmly received by the Zionist press in the United States on his visit to this country last March, and there are constant negotiations for a reunion between the N.I.Z.O. and the parent body.

In furtherance of their aspirations, and hoping for a *quid pro quo* from British imperialism, the Zionist leaders seek to draw the Jewish people into the imperialist war. "Military aid to Great Britain and her allies must be given," Ben Gurion proclaims in the above-cited article in the November, 1939, issue of *Jewish Frontier*. "The military authorities may call on our technicians and professional men for the needs of the British Army." Ben Gurion does not mention the fact that there are many thousands of misled Jewish youth already mobilized in Palestine for the needs of the British military. And while Ben Gurion called upon American Jews to be "ready," Jabotinsky arrived here with the explicit purpose of establishing a "Jewish Army" for the Allies. This was his main slogan at a meeting New York Zionist-Revisionists arranged for him at Manhattan Center on March 19. Jabotinsky admitted that a victory for the Allies would bring no hope for Jews in Europe; yet his aim is to become a partner in this war by placing a "Jewish army" at the disposal of the Allies.* A partner—

* *The New Palestine*, official organ of the Zionist organization of America, in its issue of March 22, comments editorially on Jabotinsky's address: "The setting of the stage was Revisionist in color and tone but there was a general Zionist audience in the hall and Mr. Jabotinsky's address could have been delivered without causing the slightest ripple of dissent in a meeting of official Zionist auspices."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for what purpose? For a Palestine more than double the present size (including Transjordania) where colonization would be carried through *without* justice, law or God.

Almost without exception Zionist leadership is anti-Soviet, in most cases violently so. The solution of the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union was the greatest blow Zionism has received. The fact that two million more Jews, formerly persecuted under the semi-fascist Polish government were liberated, made matters still worse—for Zionism. Zionist leadership continuously speculates on the persecution of Jewish people in various lands as a stimulus for immigration to Palestine. The destruction of the scourge of fascism in Germany would hardly be welcomed by Zionist leadership, since this would stop the flow of emigrants towards Palestine. The Jews of former Polish Ukraine and White Russia are no more candidates for emigration and can no more be told that Zionism will solve their problems; their problems have now been truly solved by the Soviets. No wonder the Zionist leadership of the World Jewish Congress (Dr. Nahum Goldman, etc.) has "recognized" the Polish "government" in France consisting of known pogromists. Zionist leadership hopes for a day when the two million Jews would be brought "back to the fold."

VI

The present imperialist war has again demonstrated that the interests of Zionism run counter to those of the Jewish people, who have nothing to gain from the imperialist war. We have seen Jabotinsky admit that "even" a victory of British-French imperialism will not bring a solution for the plight of the Jews in Europe. The *Congress Bulletin*, organ of the Zionist American Jewish Congress, in its issue of April 12, states:

"The energy generated in us by the European catastrophe will have to be spent on internal consolidation and preparation for the day when we, the only Jewry left intact, will appear before the makers of a new world to demand compensation for our people's sufferings."

The Zionist leaders have no objection to extending a war which will bring untold suffering to millions of Jews in Europe, most of whom will be uprooted, many exterminated. Zionist leadership is gratified by the thought of asking for compensation; but the Jewish people wants no *compensation*—it wants to *preserve* Jewish life—by participating in the struggle to stop this hellish imperialist war!

Zionist leadership, however, is eager to extend this war. During the first World War this leadership took some time before it decided on which side of the imperialist scale to throw its weight. That was the period when Zionist orientation went through the process of switching from German imperialism to British. In the present war the veteran servants of British imperialism jumped in with full force at the very outset. The Zionist Jewish Agency of Palestine, as we have seen, calls for the victory of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the British Empire. In the United States, the leader of American Zionism, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, declares with his customary oratorical flourishes that "our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, are with the democracies. Their fate is our fate, our future is bound up with their future." Lest there be misunderstanding as to what he means by "democracy" and "dictatorship," Mr. Wise states: "We are not morally neutral as between England and Germany, between France and Russia." (Quoted from his annual report as President of the American Jewish Congress before the conference of that body on February 11, 1940.) Mr. Wise is at war with the Soviet Union—for reasons outlined above. At the infamous Madison Square Garden meeting on December 13 Wise made a ferocious attack on the Soviet Union (the main issue was "Finland" and Herbert Hoover was an "attraction" at the meeting). Wise gave full endorsement to the expressions and efforts of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chief executive of the World Zionist Congress, to secure the formation of a Jewish legion.

The idea of a "Jewish army" has appeal for American Zionist leadership. In the editorial on the Jabotinsky meeting quoted above, *New Palestine* sympathetically outlines his demand that "the Zionist movement must . . . make its own contribution to the prosecution of the war by placing a Jewish army at the disposal of the Allies." (*New Palestine,* March 22, 1940.) And the president of the Zionist organization of America, Dr. Solomon Goldman, in a speech delivered before the twentieth annual convention of women's Zionist organization of America (Hadassah), boasted that in Palestine "one hundred and ten thousand men, twenty-five thousand women have indicated their readiness to serve in the armies of the democracies." This doubles Augur's estimate of 50,000 Jewish young men British military experts hoped to obtain through Zionist services in Palestine.

Contrary to the wishes and interests of the Jewish people in the United States as well as Palestine, Zionist leadership is trumpeting for war and has already made contact with military authorities, as admitted by Dr. Nahum Goldmann openly in the *Congress Bulletin* of April 3, 1940, and confidentially in the *Day Book of the World Jewish Congress*, which is being circulated among the "elite" of Zionist leadership. That *Day Book* contains a "strictly confidential" letter to Stephen S. Wise "from the Central Bureau of the World Jewish Congress" in Geneva, dated December 9, 1939. The letter reports that in Paris members of the executive committee sent a communication to "Premier" Sikorski of the Polish "government" established in the French capital, "declaring that the World Jewish Congress recognized his Government as the sole sovereign power in Poland and hence in the Lublin area." (*Day Book*, p. 49.) This "government" consists of known anti-Semites and pogromists, such as General Jusef Haller whose hands reek with the blood of Polish Jews. Also, this "govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment" has hopes of "restoring" the Western Ukraine and White Russia under its regime. Its anti-Semitic character is so pronounced that even the *Congress Bulletin* (April 12) is forced to express polite editorial regret over an attack contained in the official organ of this "government," *Glos Polski*, on the idea that in the contemplated Polish Republic the rights of the Jewish minority be guaranteed. Naturally, the World Jewish Congress does not propose to withdraw its "recognition" of this "government." On the contrary, the *Congress Bulletin* notes with pride that a certain Dr. Ignac Schwarzbart, who has a long record as traitor to the interests of the Polish Jews and a servant of the anti-Semitic government while still in Warsaw, "joined the Polish National Council at the behest of the World Jewish Congress."

The old line all the way through, the line of serving imperialism, a line of cooperating with pogromists.

VII

There can be no question that most followers of Zionism are sincerely seeking a solution of the Jewish problem. This does not change, however, the basic role of Zionism which from its inception has been an instrument of imperialism and reaction.

Ever since its inception Zionism has been an instrument of the Jewish bourgeoisie to hamper the struggle of the Jewish masses everywhere for their rights; a means of diverting the attention of the Jewish workers from the class struggle and of keeping them separated from the progressive forces of other nationalities. This is the case in every persecuted nationality: the reactionary chauvinistic elements strive to utilize the sufferings and despair of the people in order to mislead it, to isolate the progressive elements of that nationality with the wall of chauvinism.

While Zionism has always been telling the Jewish workers that in their struggle for liberation they must rely on themselves alone and must have no partnerships with the workers of other nationalities, it now, as always, calls for partnership with the reactionaries of other nationalities, the imperialists and war-makers. While revolutionary internationalism and the revolutionary struggle of Jewish workers together with workers of other nationalities was always condemned by the Jewish chauvinists as a betrayal of Jewish interests they now call for a Jewish army to fight for the imperialist cause. But ever since the birth of Zionism progressive Jews have been pointing out that the Jewish question cannot be solved independently of the struggle of the progressives of other nationalities.

After the Kishinev Massacre of April, 1903, Lenin told the Jewish workers that the forces of the Jews alone are not sufficient to overcome the Von Plehves and other persecutors but that they must unite with the Russian and other workers for this purpose. The Russian Revolution and the complete emancipation of the Jews together with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other peoples in the former tsarist "prison of nationalities" has fully proved the correctness of the Leninist teaching. The Jewish people can expect nothing but new betrayals and more bloodshed at the hands of British and other imperialists. It is the policy embodied in the Soviet Union which is now the safe haven of over five million Jews, a policy of friendship among nationalities, a policy of the rebirth of nationalities under a socialist order that must be supported by all progressive Jews.

It is not within the scope of this article to review the achievements of the Jewish people under socialism in the Soviet Union. We witness there the flowering of Jewish culture. There has taken place a veritable rebirth of the Jewish people economically, with hundreds of thousands of Jewish farmers, with a Jewish proletariat in heavy industry—an almost completely productive people (because of government assistance, because of the absence of any discrimination against Jews in heavy industry). The Jews in the Soviet Union have not only achieved equal rights; there are Jewish national districts in the Ukraine and the Crimea (where Jewish collective farms are concentrated) and there is the Jewish Autonomous Region of Biro-Bidjan—Jewish statehood—where Jews are acquiring all the characteristics of a full-fledged nation.

Eight days after the October Revolution, on November 15, 1917—the Soviet Government, over the signatures of Lenin and Stalin (at that time People's Commissar of Nationalities), issued the Declaration of the Rights of the Nationalities of Russia which proclaimed:

". . . the equality and sovereignty of the nations of Russia,—the right of the nations of Russia to free self-determination; the removal of every and any national and national-religious privilege and restriction; the free development of national minorities and ethnographic groups."

This declaration, the fulfilment of a policy for which Lenin and Stalin fought ever since the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party in 1903, is embodied in Article 123 of the Stalin Constitution, adopted in 1936, safeguarding all these points and calling for the prosecution of all national and racial discrimination and prohibiting special privileges for any national group to the detriment of others. As to anti-Semitism, there could be no sharper and more decisive statement than that made by Stalin in reply to an inquiry by the correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on January 12, 1931. Stalin stated:

"Replying to your inquiry, national and race chauvinism is a survival of the man-hating ethics characteristic of the period of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism, as an extreme form of race chauvinism, is the most dangerous survival of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism benefits the exploiters, for it serves as a lightning conductor to divert from capitalism the blows of the toilers. Anti-Semitism is dangerous for the toilers, for it is a false track which diverts them from the proper road

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and leads them into the jungle. Hence, Communists, as consistent internationalists, cannot but be irreconcilable and bitter enemies of anti-Semitism. In the U.S.S.R. anti-Semitism is strictly prosecuted as a phenomenon profoundly hostile to the Soviet system. According to the laws of the U.S.S.R. active anti-Semites are punished with death."

The eradication of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is not a matter of "kindness" and "decency" of this or that government leader: Anti-Semitism is "profoundly hostile to the Soviet system" which is building socialism. Under socialism, *all* national and racial discrimination and persecution is *impossible*. The lesson from this to be drawn for the Jews in the United States as well as other countries is clear: *socialism*—and only socialism—will solve the Jewish question. Alongside the every-day struggle against anti-Semitic attacks and discriminations there must be a struggle against *capitalism*, the source feeding the dark forces of the anti-Semites, the lynchers, etc.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the problems of the Jews in Palestine. Suffice it to point out that Communists are vitally interested in the security, the welfare, and the national and social liberation of the Jews living in Palestine. In its memorandum submitted to the Woodhead Commission, August, 1938, the Communist Party of Palestine stated that "they [the Jewish people] are interested in the solution of their national, social and economic problems and they are prepared to accept any solution which will grant them national, social and economic rights in Palestine as in every other country of the world." The demands embodied in that memorandum include: "national, cultural and religious autonomy for the Jewish section of the Palestinian population." The memorandum states: "The Arab countries would again throw open their doors to Jewish refugees from countries of fascist suppression as they have done many a time during the past centuries. . . . Once the nightmare of British imperialist domination" is done away with.

At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, August, 1935, the representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine stated: "We hate the Jewish Zionist bourgeoisie but we extend a fraternal hand to the Jewish toilers for a joint struggle against imperialism, against Zionism, against the bitterest enemies of the Arab and Jewish peoples in Palestine." The Communist Party of Palestine has been conducting a movement for an understanding between Jews and Arabs, which is still one of the main tasks in Palestine, an understanding that will bring about friendship and cooperation between both nationalities based primarily on a united bona fide trade union movement, with Jews and Arabs equally participating, and which will result in a common struggle against the "nightmare of British imperialism." Some excellent results were achieved prior to the outbreak of the war. The majority of both Jews and Arabs realize the harm of chauvinism, of national

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hatred, fanned by British imperialism. The recent ban against Jews issued by Britain aims to *prevent* this Jewish-Arab understanding from coming into effect, and to placate the Arab kings, to mislead the Arab people in order to exploit them for war. But the need for an understanding and for a common Jewish-Arab struggle against British domination and for a free Palestine remains, and the forces exist which actively seek this understanding.

In the United States, the struggle against economic and social discrimination (of which Jewish youth in particular are victims) and against anti-Semitism and race hatred generally, present a major task for the working class and *all* progressives, especially for Communists, non-Jews as well as Jews. Anti-Semitism is an instrument of reaction, a means to divide the people in order to exploit them and perpetuate its rule.

The anti-Semites utilize the speeches and statements of the Zionist leaders in the United States and elsewhere to brand the Jews as warmongers. But just as the warmongering servants of Wall Street do not represent the American people who strive for peace (as shown by the Gallup Poll), so the leaders of Zionism do not represent the Jewish people, who are opposed to imperialist war. During the elections for delegates to the World Zionist Congress in 1939 the Zionist movement could not get more than 80,000 votes among the five million Jews of the United States. It is rather the Jewish People's Committee with its stand against the imperialist war and for keeping the United States out of the war which represents the interests and aspirations of the Jewish people.

But precisely because of the publicity the Zionist leaders are given and because of the positions they occupy, Zionism represents a dangerous instrument for dragging the Jewish people into the war and thereby for aiding the forces working to drag America into the war. *The United States News* of April 19 boasted that there are many nationalities in the United States, such as the Scandinavians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and Austrians who because of "blood ties," are for the Allies. No doubt agents of Wall Street and British imperialism are attempting to mislead these and other national groups who, as part of the American people, are for peace. Similarly, the agents of Wall Street and British imperialism attempt to mislead the Jewish people, thereby aiming also at the interests of the American people generally. Zionism is an instrument of imperialist oppression and imperialist war, and as such must be exposed and fought by the forces of peace, socialism, and national liberation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GREETINGS TO "CLARITY"

WE GREET the appearance of the first number of *Clarity*, theoretical organ of the National Committee of the Young Communist League. The publication of *Clarity*, to be issued every two months hereafter, represents a significant step along the road of further arming the membership and leadership of the Young Communist League with the weapon of Marxist-Leninist theory. It indicates the ever greater seriousness with which the fundamental problem of studying Marxist-Leninist theory is being placed before the membership of the Young Communist League.

The dynamic growth of the youth movement in the United States amid the complicated conditions of struggle against America's involvement in imperialist war makes it imperative that every young Communist be correctly oriented by the compass of Marxism-Leninism. Because of its very scope, the youth movement has become an arena of struggle for all the major social forces of the country. Hence, clarity and firmness against all those hostile class forces and alien ideologies which are at work to weaken this movement or to divert it into channels acceptable to the imperialist bourgeoisie is a precondition for effective mass work of the Communist youth. *Clarity* will contribute greatly to this essential task by the special function which it has undertaken to fulfil.

Equally, *Clarity* will help equip the membership of the Young Communist League for the solution of that great problem, emphasized in Comrade Browder's report to the National Committee, of bringing Communism to the youth movement and really educating the youth of America in Communism.

The responsibility of the Communist Party, as vanguard of the whole toiling population of America, for assistance and guidance in the accomplishment of these great tasks gives *Clarity* a special interest and importance to the membership of the Communist Party. We heartily recommend this new voice of Communist youth to our readers.

THE COMMUNIST

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR AND REVOLUTION

By V. I. LENIN

In preparation

The forthcoming publication of Volume XIX of the **Collected Works** of Lenin, in two volumes, is an event of major political importance. Covering the period from the beginning of 1916 to March 1917, and dealing with the whole problem of imperialist war, Lenin presents a basic analysis of the development of the split in the international socialist movement, the situation in Russia and the attitude to the war of the various parties on the eve of the February Revolution, as well as all aspects of the question of self-determination of nationalities. With the publication of these two books, constituting Volume XIX, the complete works covering the period of the first World War and the two Russian Revolutions (from 1914 to 1918, Volumes XVIII to XXI inclusive, in seven books) will be available in English.

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READY NOW!

STALIN

Written by Stalin's closest co-workers, this new book constitutes a theoretical and practical history of the building of socialism in all its main phases. Each chapter illustrates the role and contributions of Joseph Stalin, as Lenin's successor, in developing and applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the solution of the historic problems facing the Soviet state which today flourishes on one-sixth of the earth's surface.

Among the contributors are V. M. Molotov, Klementi Voroshilov, L. Kaganovich, Georgi Dimitroff, Laurenti Beria, A. Andreyev, M. K. Kalinin and others.

192 pages. Cloth bound

Price 75 cents

●

THE MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH SELECTION FOR MAY

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED